UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA BULLETIN

THE LIBRARY OF THE
APR 12 1920
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

A DEBATE BULLETIN

J. W. SCROGGS, EDITOR

This bulletin is prepared for the Oklahoma High School Debating League. The Extension Division of the University never sends out materials on only one side of a question; it must furnish information on both sides or none; it will not be a propaganda for anything, not even the Multiplication Table; its sole purpose is to furnish information impartially to citizens of the State who are in need of it.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND WELFARE
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
EXTENSION DIVISION

FOREWORD

A new feature introduced in this bulletin is a number of questions the object of which is to aid in getting at the essential issues. No attempt has been made to arrange them in any logical order; in fact such an order has been avoided in order to keep from prejudicing the reader for or against either side of the question. The sole object of the questions is to compel full investigation of both sides of the subject, and to bring out more clearly the main issues and chief clashes of opinion.

The student is especially advised against one-sided study of a question. Even if the purpose of the study reaches no farther than merely winning the debate, it is best to know and do full justice to both sides. Debating should not develop partizanship. The debater should first of all be fair. He should scorn to use an argument which he believes to be untrue. To press arguments which you believe to be false not only reacts upon your own moral nature but must weaken your power to talk convincingly. To acquire facility in simulating conviction which you do not have is making you a skillful hypocrite, even if it be of some minor advantage. Believing that the arguments on the opposite side are superior to those for the side you are appointed on does not preclude your stating yours with all possible clearness and force. Knowing both sides may make you less a partizan, but a better debater.

University of Oklahoma J. W. SCROGGS
Extension Division Dept. Public Information and Welfare

QUESTION ADOPTED BY THE OKLAHOMA HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING LEAGUE FOR 1919-20

Resolved:—That Universial Military Training should be adopted in the United States.

355.2
Cr2t w

THE EFFECT ON AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS OF A POWERFUL MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT

BY HERBERT CROLY,

Editor, The New Republic, New York City

Of all the novel and perplexing problems which have been fastened on the American nation by the proposal to make a very large increase in its military and naval armament, there is none which bristles with more difficulties than the subject on which I am addressing you this morning. What will be the effect on American domestic life and institutions of a more efficient, expensive, and powerful military and naval establishment?

Americans who are opposing "preparedness" are basing their opposition largely upon the havoc which it is expected to work in our traditional internal order. Americans who are advocating "preparedness" are basing their approval largely upon the better order, which it is expected to impose upon our time-honored internal chaos. Americans who are hesitating are basing their hesitation largely upon misgivings as to the wisdom of exposing American institutions and life to the corrosive effect of such a dubious and perilous innovation. These are the questions which American public opinion is considering most anxiously and with the smallest prospect of future agreement. The country is not thinking so much about what we can and should do with a larger army and navy. It is thinking rather about what a larger army and navy may or will do to us.

Preoccupation with the domestic effects of military preparedness presided at its official birth. Last summer when President Wilson decided to include in the legislative program of the administration provision for a large army he ordered his Secretary of War to make the plans for an increase conforming to the existing American military tradition. What the President had in mind is clear. He had decided that more soldiers must be enlisted and trained presumably because they might be needed for certain practical purposes. But after having reached this decision, he was chiefly occupied, not with the number and kind of soldiers demanded by these practical needs, but with the effect of any increase at all upon the opinions and traditions of his fellow-countrymen.

He knew his proposals would meet with lively opposition based chiefly on the presumptive un-Americanism of large armies, and he preferred to bestow on the plans of the administration not so much the positive merit of careful adaption to the practical need as the negative merit of conformity to a prevailing tradition. In order to make them politically acceptable the administration plans should look unoffensive and not too unfamiliar. The American army had always been the creature of domestic political policy and so it must remain.

In adopting this course, President Wilson was behaving like a shrewd and cautious political leader. It was the course calculated to effect a certain result with the smallest friction. He has been rewarded by the practical collapse of the opposition to his program. It has been an adroit achievement and an important success. But the fullest possible recognition of the achievement should not blind us to the disadvantages of the method. The success was purchased by a lack of thoroughness in framing the details of the plans and by a lack of frankness in explaining their meaning and consequences. The technical obstacles to adequate preparation and its political penalties and dangers have been underestimated and evaded rather than courageously confronted and definitely overcome. As a result the American people are acting in a grave national crisis without any sufficient understanding of the bearing of the new policy on their past and its probable effects on their future.

The American tradition of military organization and policy which President Wilson wisht to preserve was not on its merits worth so much anxious solicitude. It called for a small standing professional army which was really no more than a national police force. Its members, organization and equipment were not adjusted to a foreign policy or an international condition. Invasion was not considered a danger against which any elaborate precautions needed to be taken. In the event of war the navy would act as a screen, behind which could be trained around a nucleus furnished by the state militia a volunteer citizen's navy. The aspect of this system which Mr. Wilson probably considered most precious was its underlying and almost complete civilianism. It included a professional army, to be sure, but only in insignificant numbers. The United States depended ultimately for its soldiers upon its citizens and it had consequently no reason to fear the corruption of its democratic institutions and ideals by a military caste or spirit. All this is true, but it is also true that the system was a tissue of inadequacies and contradictions. It evaded every difficulty and

ignored every serious responsibility involved by military preparedness.

A democracy should depend ultimately for its soldiers on its citizens; but our traditional system only pretended to create an armed citizenry. Its trained soldiers were prevented from being citizens; its citizens were never sufficiently trained to be good soldiers. The American people had no reason to fear their army, but neither had the possible enemies of the American people. It was not intended to be dangerous to anybody but a few foreign or domestic marauders. Congress always refused to incorporate in it a coherent formative idea. It was partly professional and partly amateur, partly under national and partly under state jurisdiction, partly based upon the idea of service and partly upon an appeal to mercenary motives. But above all it was wholly and intentionally innocuous. It was essentially an attempt to assure civilian control over the military machine less by making the civil authority strong, clear-sighted, able and worthy, than by making the army feeble and incompetent.

If, as President Wilson decided last summer, the American democracy was finally faced by the necessity of seriously preparing during peace for the possibility of war, this national tradition in military organization needed to be radically modified rather than loyally cherished and preserved. The traditional military system can be fairly characterized as organized unpreparedness. Americans had believed themselves immune from the grim necessity of anticipating and providing either against social evils at home or the defense of national policies abroad. America was the promised land precisely because it was delivered from such moral and physical stresses and from the structural reenforcement, necessary to withstand them. Some years ago, one-half of these expectations began to be abandoned. It became only too apparent that American domestic economy is not a stream which purified in the running. It had developed the same social disorders as the older European societies and similar precautions must be taken against them. The decision to increase the army and navy means the abandonment also of the other half. The organized unpreparedness of our military system had been based upon a conception of international relationships and of ensuing American dangers, opportunities and responsibilities which had ceased to be true. The indispensable condition of any effective military preparation was a declaration of war against an essential aspect of the very tradition which the President was seeking so sedulously to preserve.

In so far as the American tradition in military organization

consisted in the strict and absolute subordination of the military and naval machines to ultimate civilian control and their employment for valid political purposes, everygood American will attach the utmost importance to its preservation. But in so far as the civilian control was obtained by paralyzing the army rather than by organizing the nation, strengthening its government and clarifying its policy, the existing tradition manifestly constitutes an insuperable obstacle to effective military preparation. The larger army and navy must be intended and made ready for actual definite service. In so far as it is ready for specific service, the army must be a dangerous weapon. It must be dangerous to the possible enemies of the United States; and it must be dangerous to our traditional internal equilibrium. Unless the American people are willing and ready to create a powerful weapon, which if misused would prove to be harmful to them no less than their possible enemies, the money and energy spent on military preparations will continue to be a colossal waste. As a matter of fact the American people proved more willing to create a powerful weapon than its chosen leaders imagined. The original program of the administration was indeed framed to look innocuous rather than dangerous. It was based chiefly upon the principle of amplifying our deficiencies. But the original program has been radically modified, and every modification has tended to make it less innocuous and more dangerous. A reluctant Democratic administration and Congress, which had every disposition to keep down the scope and cost of military "preparedness", have been forced by the logic of their own decision to build very much more than they intended. The final legislation is likely to provide for a really formidable fighting force—one which will be measurably adjusted in size, training and equipment to the probable needs of national policy.

The outstanding fact in the proposed military re-organization is the increase in the professional standing army. In the original plan little attempt was made to convert the regular army into a force which was capable of defending the territory of the United States against invasion or promoting its policies abroad. That task was reserved for a body of national militia which was subsequently modified by the House Committee into a body of "federalized" state militia. But the more these bodies of militia were examined the more untrustworthy they looked; and the more public opinion came to favor an increase in the regular army as the one really dependable military force. The regular army is being increased until, with its own automatically created reserve, it may, if it can be recruited, afford a sufficient protec-

tion against invasion, and protection against invasion is what the public and the military experts have on the tops of their minds. But merely as a consequence of organizing an effective army for defense Congress has done very much more. It has organized an army which may also constitute a formidable aggressive force. Instead of creating as the President and the Democratic leaders intended, a safe and sane army, they are being driven to create a really dangerous army—a professional force, as far as possible removed from the conception of an armed citizenry.

The new American army will be unsafe for two reasons. An army of this kind is really adapted chiefly to service abroad and consequently to something more than a defensive foreign policy. It is also the kind of an army which will have a profound reaction on American domestic life, because as a consequence of its increased size and authority, it will be constantly making imperative demands upon the civil authorities which they will be reluctant to grant and which will raise the issue between civil and military control over American policy. These are prescisely the questions which the President wished to avoid, as they have been avoided in the past, but from now on they will wax increasingly troublesome. The new army could not be made serviceable, without becoming unsafe, because in the opinion of too many American citizens, a safe army meant an imperiled country. In truth there was no way in which the domestic life and institutions of the nation could be guaranteed against far-reaching modifications as a consequence of substituting organized preparedness for organized unpreparedness. An efficient new military and naval establishment is bound in the end to do something important to the American people, and the certainty of a drastic result should be recognized in advance. Confident prophecies are being made as to what this drastic result will be. Many good Americans predict that our democracy will be ruined by their new and dangerous servant. Others predict with equal confidence that a more powerful army and widespread military training is necessary not merely to save the nation from its possible foreign enemies but to preserve it from its domestic infirmities. Neither of these predictions need to be taken too seriously. They are the expression of fears and hopes rather than a disinterested estimate of the action of social forces. Although drastic result will certainly follow, what that result will be is by no means so certain. It will depend less upon the size and organization of the army and the navy than upon the way in which the nation decides to use them.

At present the American people have not made up their

mind how they will use their new army and navy, and anti-militarists are insisting that the creation of the larger army and navy should be postponed until they do. I cannot agree with them. We shall have to take the risk of preparing first and of deciding later just what we are preparing for. To have refused to prepare would under the circumstances have been an indication of inertia and weakness. To have begun to prepare is on the whole a symptom of self-confidence. It indicated that the country is not afraid to plunge forward even though somewhat blindly and to risk the assumption of a perilous and costly responsibility which before it is redeemed may diminish many prescriptive rights, damage many vested interests and perhaps change the whole outlook of the American democracy.

The American nation needs the tonic of a serious moral adventure. It has been too safe, too comfortable, too complacent and too relaxed. Its besetting weakness is the prevalence of individual and collective irresponsibility, based on the expectation of accomplishing without effort. Living as it did in a favored land which was not exposed to attack from without and which offered to good Americans surpassing opportunities to satisfy their own special and individual purposes, our democracy has not been required to pull itself together. It has depended for its cohesion upon loyalty to an achieved and essentially complete constitutional system, and upon a suppositious harmony between individual or local, and public or national interests. Unlike European countries, it could afford to leave the satisfaction of many public objects to the results of an accidental concern among individuals, groups of individuals, or local political units. It has been reluctant to create powerful political or economic organs for the accomplishment of its national purposes, and when instruments of this kind came into existence as the result of automatic and political forces, the instinct of the democracy was to dissolve rather than to discipline its unmanageable servants. It has not liked the responsibility of turning such potentially dangerous agents as a centralized administration, an authoritative legislature, an efficient army or any concentrated embodiment of industrial power to beneficial public use.

The European war has proved sufficiently the impossibility of seriously preparing for a possible war without calling upon the whole industrial system for assistance. If the American industrial system is not prepared to render that assistance promptly and completely, the country would be unprepared for serious military or naval operations—no matter how well its soldiers were trained and

equipped.

Of even more importance to adequate preparedness than these measures of political, financial and industrial reorganization is an effective method of securing for the new military and naval program the support of the wage-earners. In the event of a war which involved the national safety they could be counted on to volunteer in sufficient numbers; but that is not the question. Assuming that the United States is to have an army, which even in the times of peace will require of an increasing proportion of the wage-earners of the country a certain share of their time and labor, how can they be induced to give what is needed? It is the answer to this question which will arouse in the near future the most lively controversy, and upon the way it is answered will largely depend the reaction of a larger military and naval establishment upon American domestic institutions and life. In the past the government has relied for the recruits to the army and the navy upon the expedient of tempting men to volunteer, but if this expedient is to succeed in the future, the temptation will have to be very much increased. It is doubtful whether the new army can be recruited, save at an excessive cost. For this and for many other reasons an aggressive and insistent element in public opinion is demanding the substitution of compulsion for the volunteer principle.

The agitation for compulsory military service bears particularly hard on the subject under discussion, because the arguments in favor of compulsion are derived from social and political rather than military sources. It is not pretended that the nation needs the military serivce of all the young men of America; but it is claimed that the young men of America need the benefit of military service. Instead of as at present paying some young men to enter an essentially public occupation, they wish the burden and the opportunity of the employment to be imposed on all alike, without fear and without favor. That is the way really to democratize the American army. Universal service raises American citizens of all classes and sections, if not of both sexes, to the level of an irksome common obligation; and this obligation brings with it to an extent which political and social obligations do not, the occasion for common association. The experience would enable the young soldier to realize how far he is a member of a community and how much fellowship in the community means. It is the real solution of the ideal in an armed citizenry. The nation would obtain soldiers who were citizens and citizens who were soldiers.

The argument of those Americans, who are seeking to give a

positive social value to the military system and convert it into a source of national unity, culminates in the foregoing contention. Instead of consdering the army as a troublesome excresence on American life, they propose to work it into the very fabric of the nation. It is to be made the heroic remedy for the insidious disease of national incoherence. By being universalized, military service is converted into a most effective form of compulsory national education. American citizens will be pulled together by the force of active comradeship in common labor and genuine sacrifices for the national welfare.

The idea of making the military system contribute something of positive value in the domestic life of the country is sound, but it breaks down when worked as hard as it is by the advocates of compulsory service. They are following the bad example of the traditional American democrats in insisting that the size of the military establishment should be determined by its expected reaction on American domestic life. The traditional democrats were reluctant to let the nation have as many soldiers or as much military training as might be needed, because they presupposed a necessary antagonism between democracy and military preparation. The contemporary advocates of universal service seek the enlistment and training of more soldiers than are needed, because they believe that the American who has undergone military training will constitute a better rather than a worse citizen. Both of them are falling into the mistake so common to golf players of keeping their eye too much upon the hole and not enough upon the ball. The former have more fear of military training than they have confidence in democracy; the latter have more confidence in military training than they have confidence in democracy. Both need to understand that an army is one thing and a democracy is another. An army is a delicate and dangerous instrument which may be called upon to perform the terrible work of killing and submitting to being killed and which needs to be adjusted to the probable nature and amount of this work. A democracy is a form of political and social organization, which, because it fastens on the whole people ultimate responsibility for the public welfare, depends for its fulfillment upon the ability of men to rise to higher opportunities. The two are not divided by any necessary incompatibility, and it would be a timid and rudimentary democracy which tied itself to a policy of mis-armament merely because it is afraid to let enough of its citizens become properly trained soldiers. But if the two are not divided by an incompatibility neither are they tied together by mutual dependence. While a democracy

may obtain incidental educational benefits from universal military training, only an impoverished democracy would rely upon compulsory military training service for the education of its citizens in the essentials of citizenship. The American army will never be brought into wholesome relations with the American democracy until we cease to consider it either as a bogey or as a vehicle of civic grace. It is primarily a machine, planned and prepared to accomplish some desperately important and extremely hazardous practical work.

The usual explanation that the United States is preparing only for defense, which is a policy on which all good citizens can agree, merely begs the question. A nation like Switzerland may arm purely for defense, because a small nation even if armed to the teeth is incapable of aggression, and because it cannot have an enemy of any size, which would not be large enough to threaten its independence; but, in the case of a wealthy, populous and geographically isolated nation like the United States no sharp line can be drawn between defensive and aggressive armament. As has been frequently pointed out, the new army and navy will be required to defend a policy rather than merely a coast line. If the United States is invaded the invasion will originate not in a wanton attack from a strong military and naval power, but in a clash with a similar power over a difference of opinion about neutral rights at sea, the Open Door in China or the Monroe Doctrine in South America. In the event of such a quarrel there is really little difference between fighting to defend a policy and fighting to promote it. The Monroe Doctrine and the Open Door are from certain points of view aggressive policies, about the meaning and justice of which wide differences of opinion may exist both in this and inother countries. Hence what we need most of all to understand is the nature and scope of the policies in the interest of which we shall organize an efficient and dangerous army and navy. Until this is known not only can we not cauculate how many and what kind of sailors and soldiers we may need and what sacrifices the American people may fairly be asked to make for them, but we shall be equally at a loss to estimate the moral and political reaction of the military preparations upon American domestic life.

Thus the dubious aspect of the existing situation does not consist in the fact or in the cost of preparedness but in the ambiguity of its underlying purposes. The American people are being asked to pay heavily in labor and money for a new army and navy as a weapon of self-defence, because only in this way can con-

tentious matters be avoided and a sufficiently general measure of popular support be frightened into existence. Yet there is a very real probably that the new army and navy will be used chiefly for positive and for aggressive as opposed to merely defensive purposes. These positive purposes can be made in my opinion even more justifiable than a negative defensive policy, but their value and meaning is obscured because they are not frankly admitted, fully discussed and sufficiently defined. As long as they remain ambiguous and obsucre, they create and encourage a dangerously suspicious and evasive attitude towards the question of preparedness . The socialists are already declaring that the new army and navy are intended as the instruments of imperialistic exploitation in Mexico and Central America, and the accusation cannot be answered either by silence or abuse. As a matter of fact if the soldiers which will be recruited and trained for the new army see active service anywhere, they are more likely to see it, just as the old army has, outside rather than inside the United States. The service beyond the seas may be susceptible of complete justification as a matter of democratic national policy, but it cannot be justified as a matter of self-defense, and only gradually will it be met with the same general approval and support as would an exclusively defensive service.

So we get back to the consideration which has been implicit in this whole discussion. The probable reaction of military preparedness upon America domestic life and institutions will be determined finally by the ability of the nation to assimilate the dangerous, unmanageable and exciting intruder into its moral organization. The work of assimilation depends in part upon our ability to create an army and a navy whose officers and enlisted men do not cease to participate in the civilian occupations and interests, yet who at the same time are not prevented by civilian meddling from doing thoroughly well their own special work. But it depends still more upon the national policy of which the new army and navy will be the chief instrument. In creating such an instrument the American nation is not submitting itself passively to the benign influence of a militaristic Saint Michael. Neither is it submitting itself passively to the malign influence of a militaristic dragon. Neither is it pursuing a course which like the menace in the army and the navy after the Spanish American war, will leave its domestic life and institutions practically unchanged. What it is doing is to adopt a new and hazardous course, which in case it is to be successfully carried through will require certain radical changes in the intellectual and normal make-up of the American

democracy.

The good American should consequently neither denounce nor glorify military preparedness. He should rather do what he can to make the country equal to its newly assumed responsibilities. The probability is that the effect of the adventure will be disastrous unless the American people can improve their political and economic organization, socialize their industries and convert their educational system into a source of democratic citizenship. Efficient and elaborate military preparations will neither prevent us from making these improvements nor assure their attainment. They must be obtained, if at all, on their own merits and by a sufficient concentration of purpose and effort upon special jobs, each in their turn. What the work of military preparation may do is to help the American people obtain the habit of concentrated attention upon their own collective tasks. As a result of an increase in concentration they should be able to rise more completely both to their obligations and opportunities, but no such result necessarily follows. It all depends upon the national policies, domestic and foreign, in the interest of which the fruits of concentration are used.

The decision to prepare, consequently, decided very little. The larger army and navy will of itself bring neither ruin nor regeneration to the American people. It will not even bring additional security, for security is a matter of comparative rather than actual armament. By deciding to prepare the American nation has issued a challenge to itself to use more foresight, more intelligence, and more purpose in the management of its affairs. Its more powerful army and navy like its more energetic and efficient government must be made the organ of a policy, which will consciously and tenaciously make for individual and social betterment. Such a policy has not yet been completely formulated, but the experiments and the discussions of the past year have indicated the direction in which it must be sought. All Americans who wish the national military and naval establishment to be a boon rather than a curse to their country should turn their attention to the business of formulating it. The foreign policy of a democracy can be democratized only as a result of a sufficient measure of popular understanding and goodwill; and upon the democratizing of American foreign policy will depend the democratizing of its most dangerous organ,—a large and powerful military and naval establishment.

THE DEMOCRACY OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE

BY FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS, LL. D..
Professor of Sociology and History of Civilization, Columbia University

This topic is resolvable into propositions of the indispensable science of guess work. There is no way of knowing what the effect of a large military and naval establishment on our domestic institutions and policy will be. The factors of causation are many, and the contngencies are uncertain. Nevertheless, we must guess as well as we can. Marvellous as the achievements of experimental science have been, and great as the accumulations of verified knowledge are, mankind yet goes on its daily way, in matters social and political, by guessing. It becomes important, therefore, to guess well. For practical purposes the difference between good guessing and bad guessing is incalcuable. The social and political sciences are attempts to establish principles and methods of good guessing, in these domains.

The fundamental principles of good guessing are no other than those of scientific method in general and perhaps this fact offers as good a reason as any that could be found in justification of our temerity in speaking of social and political sciences. A careful discrimination of facts, qualities, and kinds of things, one from another, is the first requirement. Painstaking measurement, or estimate, of qualities is the second requirement. In attempting to guess what the effect of a large military and naval establishment upon our domestic institutions and policy will be, we shall plunge wildly unless we keep these requisites of method continually in mind.

The area of Europe, which its 25,000,000 to 30,000,000 soldiers are expected to defend or to devastate, as occasion arises, is 3,754,282 square miles. The area of the United States, plus the area of Alaska and the area of our island possessions, is 3,743,306 square miles, or only 10,979 square miles less than the total area of Europe.

If we had a peace-footing army of one million men and trained reserves of five million men, we should have for the protection of our continental area, Alaska, and island possessions, less than one fifth of the military establishment maintained upon the equal area of Europe; Japan and all other nations being left out of the reckoning. It is permissible to any free born American to call such a measure of prepardness "mili-

tarism" if he wants to. There are intellects, here and there, that function that way.

So I offer my first contribution to our guessing match upon the probable effect of a large military establishment in the United States. My guess is that a peace-footing army of one million men, and a trained reserve force of five million more men would have, so far as any reaction of mere magnitude is concerned, absolutely no effect whatever upon our American domestic life. It would be neither more or less appreciable than a police force of 15,000 men in this city of Philadelphia, with its population of more than one million and a half inhabitants.

The magnitude, however, of a military establishment is by no means the only or the most important factor to be regarded when forecasting its probable reactions. Far more important than any dimensions that we are likely to have to consider, is the character or type of the army that we might create in the United States. Like England we have been, and are now, committed to a hired or professional army which, next after monarchy and hereditary rank, is the most undemocratic thing that man has so far invented. A hired army does not have to be large to establish undemocratic standards and to cause mischievous irritation. When the European war is over, the class struggle will break forth afresh, with fourfold energy. I think that we may confidently anticipate that the forces of organized labor and of socialism will actively oppose professional armies. Rightly or wrongly, they will insist that a professional army may, at any time, be used by a dominant capitalism to quell strikes and to put down an industrial revolution.

International socialism, to its honor, is opposed to all preventable war, but it does not feel about universal military service as it feels about a hired and professional army. Universal military training puts all citizens on the same footing. The proletarian, like the man who hires him, is taught the manual of arms, and, in the event of war, the man who hires him is equally liable with other men to take his chance in the trenches.

Many of you here present doubtless remember, as I do, the bitterness engendered by that form of conscription to which the federal government resorted to in our Civil War. My father was a minister of a Congregational church in a country village, and I vividly recall my impressions of scenes in

our home when women of humble circumstances came for a word of comfort, holding in trembling hands the tear-blotted scrap of paper that told of the death of husband or son, and, child as I was, I felt their smarting sense of injustice that their loved ones had to go to the battle field while the relatively well-to-do manufacturer and the merchant could buy substitutes. I do not need to argue, for you all know, that the worst of England's troubles in the present war have been directly attributable to her initial reliance upon an inadequate professional army, helped out by volunteers; while the superb democratic solidarity of France is attributable to the equality and justice of a universal training requirement, which puts all men of high or low degrees on the same footing in the face of suffering and fate.

So I make my second guess, which is that if we create a hired army of more than half a million men, and do not back it up by some form of universal military training and requirement, we shall engender irritation and distrust; we shall unnecessarily intensify the class struggle; and we shall disintegrate such democratic solidarity as we yet enjoy. Whereas, if we follow the examples of Switzerland and of France; recognize the responsibility of every able bodied citizen for the defense of his country; give every man a good, but not too exacting military training, we shall inspire all citizens with the conviction that our institutions are founded in justice and duty, and shall thereby invigorate our democracy,

These possible reactions of a larger military establishment are, I conceive, the most important ones to take account of. There are others not to be ignored. I will content myself with a brief consideration of two.

It is generally acknowledged by unprejudiced persons that military training may have an educational value. I count myself fortunate that in my college days I enjoyed such training for a time, under the instruction of Captain, afterwards General, Thomas Ward of the Regular Army. I learned many valuable things, that, as it turned out, I should have had no other opportunity in my life, to learn, and that the whole have contributed to my physical health, my sense of social duty, and my comprehension of the importance of efficiency in team work. Incidentally I learned, I think, the moral no less than the marching distinction between guiding right and guiding left, and I have since been trying to "guide right."

It is urged by men whose intelligence and distinction

carry great weight that all of the educational advantages of military discipline may and should be obtained through other means. Cannot setting up exercises, cooperative activity, accuracy, regular habits, and all the rest be taught apart from their associations with war? Undoubtedly they might be, and they should be. Nevertheless, they are not, in our schools or in our colleges. After lifelong association with educational interests, I regret to have to say that I see very little reason to expect that these disciplines will be effectively developed in America unless the demand for them have come from the same source that has demanded and obtained them in continental Europe and in Australia. It is a thing one would rather not say, but is is true; we are a loose-minded and a loose mannered people. Money making, and fads invented by lunatics are the only things we take seriously. I share the conviction which has been growing in many minds, that this deplorable state of mind, and of behavior is in no small measure the consequence of our fatuous custom of letting our young people "go on the loose," instead of holding them to tasks, duties, discipline, and achievement.

As a fact of experience it seems not to be true that the average man will do the things that he should do merely because they are expedient and right. He does them under economic or social pressure. Economic pressure in the United States by comparison with economic pressure in the old world, has been relatively light; and our social pressure is formless and relatively inefficient because, in cutting loose from the aristocratic traditions and conventions of an older world community we have, at the same time, cut loose from a priceless heritage of human wisdom, in the vain thought that the laws of the universe are suspended in the Western Hemisphere.

Among the precepts of wisdom that we have been trying desperately to ignore is the truth that human beings do not do things for their health, bodily or spiritual until their health is gone. They do things in the day's work because they have to; they do things for fun because they like to. The well-set-up "cop," the fireman, the middy, and the soldier, do not take their exercises and their drills because they have reasoned that such exertions are good for them; they take them under social pressure, because they have to, on penalty of losing their jobs.

Here we have the crux of the whole question of the edu-

cational value of military training. Education as education, school boys and college boys do not take seriously in this country, and they will not take it seriously until they feel a social pressure more effectively organized than any we now have. Young men do take military training seriously, they are set up and disciplined by it because they feel that it is linked to tremendous realities, because it is a recognition of the solemn fact that nations have been obliged to repel invasion and put down insurrection, and that the necessity may arise again. It is associated with convictions of obligation, with love of country, with loyalty, and obedience.

Yes, with obedience. I am well aware that one half at least of that opposition to preparedness which parades as pacifism is neither more nor less than an anarchistic revolt against the teaching of obedience. I should be in sympathy with it if obedience were now, as in other days it was, submission to irresponsible power or authority. But obedience today, in America at least, as in Switzerland and in France, is another thing. It is a loyal and rational acquiescence in the general will; it is the act of being republican; it is the act of being democratic as distinguished from the verbal democracy of the humbug and the blatherskite. And this democracy of act, of loyal obedience to the general will, of willing sacrifice for the general good, is the republicanism that we need; it is the democracy that we must have if we are to be a nation respecting ourselves, and worthy of the world's respect.

Upon the second of the possible minor reactions of a larger military establishment than we have hitherto had in the United States, I shall be still more brief. Is there danger that by recognizing the importance of general military training, and by adopting it, we shall become interested in miltary operations for their own sake, and insensitive to the dreadfulness of war? Granting that the maintenance of an adequate army of defense, and a powerful navy would not in itself be militarism, should we, nevertheless, by creating such establishments be entering upon a perilous course leading to militarism in the end? My answer to this question is like the answers that I have given to the questions already considered: I call your attention to certain facts and discriminations. Where, in all human history, do you find that republican and democratic populations have become militaristic? Where, in all human history, do you find monarchies that have not become, or tended to become militaristic? Militarism is not a simple

phenomenon; it is a highly complex product of many factors intricately combined. Monarchism harks back to ancient days, to reactionary instincts; it is intrenched in privilege; it resists change. But mankind progresses. Progress endangers monarchy; it threatens it with overthrow. Monarchism as such cares nothing for the populace, except as a base of supply and a fighting force. Monarchy is excited by progress; it casts about for policies to turn progress to its own account; militarism is the sum of the policies that it adopts. Militarism is, in fine, a policy of monarchy excited by progress. Democracy has nothing to gain by aggressive war—but everything to lose. Both instinctively and rationally democracies realize that such is the truth. Their danger lies not at all in a possible drift toward militarism; it lies rather in a failure to grasp the complexities of international interests and relations as they stand in the world today; in a failure to realize that good behavior by the well-intentioned is no protection against aggression by the ruthless. The danger of republics and democracies lies in the immense difficulty of arousing democratic masses to an appreciation of the importance of forecast, of preparation, of timely organization, of the development of efficiency to meet contingencies not only possible but, in the imperfect and by no means righteous world of today, in the highest degree probable.

What I have said about the probable reactions of a larger military establishment on land applies, I think, in the main to the question of the probable effect upon our domestic life and institutions of a large naval establishment. We may safely assume that the United States does not need the largest navy in the world, or even a navy as large as that of Great Britain. But we have long lines of coasts to protect, and the outlying possessions of Alaska and our Pacific Islands. By creating a navy second to that of Great Britain, and larger than any other, we should merely measure our naval strength according to the amount of work that it may be called upon to perform. And I offer as my final guess in this discussion that neither individual nor nation can undermine character or endanger free institutions by foresight of events, evidence, provision of applicances, and discipline of strength according to the measure of responsibility and of obligation. It was not an alarmist who said: "He that provideth not for his own, is worse than an infidel."

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE AND DEMOCRACY

By George Nasmyth, Ph. D., author of "Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory; A Study of Force as a Factor in Human Relations."

If any person had predicted two years ago that the people of America would be seriously discussing the adoption of universal military service in 1917, he would have been looked upon as a visionary. But since the outbreak of the war in Europe, the rising tide of reaction which resulted from the international reign of terror; the increasing power of militarism in the world; and the great preparedness campaign which was carried to a successful conclusion in 1915 and 1916, have led step by step, to an increasing agitation for universal military service, as an essential part of the system of national defense.

The advocates of universal military service are not limited to military officers like General Leonard A. Wood or to partisans of a "big stick" policy in dealing with other nations, like Colonel Roosevelt. The growing importance of the subject is witnessed by the recent accession to their ranks of President Emeritus Charles W. Eliot, widely known as a protagonist of democracy, and of Prof. Ralph Barton Perry, who has attempted to show that democracy has nothing to fear from universal military service.

Moreover, laws have actually been passed in the closing hours of the session of the legislature in New York State providing for military training in the high school and universal military service for all young men between the ages of 18 and 21. Finally the national defense act passed by the United States Congress in July, 1916, gives to the military authorities the power to "draft" men into the army whenever voluntary enlistments shall be insufficient, so that universal military service or conscription, to use a more convenient term for the same idea, has been established as a legal principle in the Empire State and in the nation.

The fact that these laws were passed in the closing hours of legislature sessions, without adequate discussion and without complete understanding on the part of the people on the issues involved, makes it inevitable that the debate shall be re-opened in the near future. The principle at issue is fundamental, in a democracy, and the most widespread discusson of the subject should be welcomed by all who believe in the power of an enlightened public opinion to decide rightly on fundamental principles.

Universal Military Service and Preparedness

The case for universal military service rests on entirely dif-

ferent grounds than does the general case for preparedness. If we did not have our other five lines of national defense which protect us from any attack from European or Asiatic powers, there might be some justification in this universal military service in America. But with two oceans, one 3000 and the other 5000 miles in width; the navy, the second largest in the world; submarines, which make the transport of large bodies of troops across great distances a most hazardous undertaking; automatic and electric contact mines and coast fortifications, such as have made it impossible for the Allies successfully to land troops on the shores of Germany or even Turkey, even when the Allies were backed by a naval force three or four times greater than that of the Central European Powers— with all these first lines of defense, not even the most fearful and extreme of our militarists pretend that an army of seven to ten million men, which the system of universal military service would give us after a few years of building up reserves who had passed through the military machine, would be necessary to repel an actual invasion on American soil. Even Roosevelt does not demand an army of more than 250,000 men and a reserve army of 400,000 men to meet his requirements for an "adequate" national defense, and no one has seriously urged that our preparedness needs require an army of universal service proportions.

But the volunteer system will fail, it is argued. Even the standing army of 250,000 men and the militia of 400,000 provided for in the national defense act cannot be raised by the voluntary method.

An Army of Social Service

If this force is needed, it can be raised by the right kind of an appeal to the American people. This involves a fundamental transformation of an army from its old-world character of a machine trained solely for wholesale murder, to a new world army of social service. An army of labor trained in the work of reforestation, of building great highways, instructed in methods of camp sanitation and effective cooperation; from which every man would come out a more useful member of society and a more productive economic unit, would make a far different appeal to American young men than the standing army on the present system, or even a National Guard of the socially elite. With this employment in useful production should go adequate compensation, just as there goes adequate compensation for police work, for the work of firemen and life-savers. Under a really democratic system of social service such as this, there will be no difficulty in finding all the

men that are needed, without resort to conscription.

But since the case which can be made out for compulsory service is so weak from the point of view of military necessity, its advocates fall back on other arguments; it will unify the nation; it will increase patriotism; it will form greatly needed habits of obedience and discipline. These arguments constitute, in brief, the case for conscription, around which the great debate will rage, and they are so important that they should be subjected to the most searching analysis.

Democracy

Does universal military service involve equal sacrifice on the part of rich and poor alike? If both are killed, of course, both have made the last sacrifice, and so far as their individual lives are concerned, it is equal. But for the families of the two men the difference is very great. For the family of the poor man, the loss of the breadwinner means that the widow must go out to work, that the children must be deprived of an opportunity for education, that their whole lives must be limited because they did not have the opportunities they would have had if their father had lived. For the rich man, on the contrary, no such sacrifice on the part of his family is involved. His wife in not compelled to go out and work, his children are not deprived of the opportunity of receiving a liberal education. If a conscription of wealth were advocated as a companion measure to a conscription of lives, there might be some justification for the argument on a basis of democracy. But a conscription of lives alone, such as is advocated by the believers in universal military service, is fundamentally unjust, if the family, instead of the individual, is considered as the real unit and the foundation of the nation's life.

Even if the sacrifice of life is not involved, the sacrifice of time required for universal military service imposes an unequal burden upon the rich and poor. For the rich man, Plattsburg is an enjoyable vacation, and a longer period of military service would not be any great hardship, but for the poor man it means a definite interruption of his economic life, the stopping of his earnings, a postponement of the time when he can afford to marry, an interruption of his difficult task of getting foothold in his trade or small business. In Germany, it is estimated that the economic loss involved by taking a young man from the farm, for example, is equivalent to about $500 a year, and the father has to hire Polish or Italian laborers to take the place of the son who goes to serve for two years in the Kaiser's army, but for the rich man, military service offers a career, an entrance to the ranks of soicety, the

opening of positions in the government service and educational advantages of technical training in the officers' college. No element of equality of sacrifice can be discovered in the two cases.

Those who believe that class distinctions can be broken down and democracy created by regimenting men into masses and forcing them to drill together, have missed the central idea of democracy which is based on the principle of voluntary cooperation, of equality of opportunity, and the abolition of caste privileges. Those who believe that democracy can be imposed from without by force and point to the examples of France and Switzerland, should analyze the condition in those countries more deeply. As soon as we penetrate below the surface, we find in each of them a great conflict between the forces of militarism and democracy. This conflict rages in all countries where universal military service is established, and it has been revealed in all its bitterness by the vivid, lightning flashes of the Dreyfus affair in France, the Zabern incident in Germany, and the Ulster crisis in the British Army—all parallel instances of successful struggles for the supremacy of the military over the civil powers of government. In France the revanche movement which brought about the Russo-French Alliance, the three year conscription law of 1912, and the outcome of the Morocco crisis of 1911, all represented victories of the military caste over the forces of democracy and the popular government.

Switzerland has not had an aggressive militarism of the Pan-German type, it is true, but this is not due to any lack of desire on the part of the Swiss military officers who are like military officers the world over. It has been due to the fact that Switzerland is a small country and any propaganda for a career of "national destiny", or the conquest of the world would render its advocates ludicrous. The military spirit, however, and its fundamental opposition to democracy is essentially the same in Switzerland as in Germany or France, as is witnessed, for example, by the testimony of Swiss Social Democrats at the International Socalist Congress in Stuttgart and other centers.

Everywhere militarism has been the most formidable enemy of democracy. For every million soldiers you must have at least 30,000 officers, and these 30,000 officers must make the military profession their life work. They must cultivate an iron will and a spirit of domination as essential elements of success, and necessarily they chafe with impatience at the discussions and restraints of democracy and the civil powers of government. Altogether they constitute a source of ever present danger to the peace of a

nation which is powerful enough to be a menace to the world.

The testimony of representative British and German statemen—Viscount Bryce, former Ambassador to America, and of Bismarck himself, is illumunating in this connection.

The reason why we have had one hundred years of peace in the English speaking world, according to Viscount Bryce, is because we have had so little militarism in America in the past. In the introduction to Prof. Dunning's book on "The British Empire and the United States", Bryce says the during a number of years the American masses would not have opposed war with England but "fortunately . . . . . the country was free from a pernicious military caste which worked such frightful evil in Europe, being indeed driven to desire opportunities for practising the work for which the profession exists."

This is the testimony of a British statesman. On the other hand Bismarck in his "Reflections and Reminiscences," Chapter XXII, tells us definitely how the Prussian militarists tried to push him into war, how he used this militarist pressure to throw the country into war with Austria in 1866 and with France in 1870, and how he had to resist the powerful militarist pressure towards war in 1867, in 1875 and on other occasions. Bismarck says on page 102, volume II:

> It is natural that in the staff of the army not only younger active officers, but likewise experienced stratgeists, should feel the need of turning to account the efficiency of the troops led by them, and their own capacity to lead, and of making them prominent in history. It would be a matter of regret if this effect of the military spirit did not exist in the army; the task of keeping its results within such limits as the nations' need of peace can justly claim is the duty of the political, not the military, heads of the state.
>
> That at the time of the Luxemburg question, during the crisis of 1875, invented by Gortschakoff and France, and even down to the most recent times, the staff and its leaders have allowed themselves to be led astray and to endanger peace, lies in the very spirit of the institution.
>
> If the breakdown of civilization in Europe has anything to teach America, surely it is the danger of any increase in the forces or the philosophy of militarism.

Discipline

The second argument for universal military service is that it will promote discipline. It will teach obedience and respect for authority, it is urged, and these elements are greatly needed in American life. The trouble here is the kind of discipline which military service provides. It is a discipline enforced from without and breaks down as soon as the restraining force is removed. The

whole object of military training is to secure instantaneous obedience without thought, to make a man a part of an automatic military machine so that if he is ordered to sink the Lusitania or destroy Louvain, he will obey instantly and unquestioningly. Such unthinking obedience is far removed from that self-imposed discipline, that respect for laws because they have been enacted by common consent and for the welfare of the people; of freedom of discussion, of speech, of press, of assembly, and of concience, which are the foundation stones of a self-governing democracy. The history of Prussia illustrates clearly the inevitable results of military discipline. At first, the German people opposed conscription bitterly, but after a few generations of men had been put through the military machine and taught the right kind of obedience, all opposition ceased. Germany became a servile state. More and more power was given into the hands of the military caste, and the events which have occurred since August 1, 1914, have been well called "The Nemesis of docility."

National Unity

The third argument is that it will promote Americanization, it will heal all our divisions of race and nationality, eliminate the hyphen, and unify the American people.

The experience of European nations which have tried to meet similar problems by this method is in flat contradition to such an assumption. In Austria militarism has reigned with undisputed sway, but universal military service for generations has failed to unite Germans and Bohemians, Poles, and Czechs and Slave in the ideal unity which our militarists picture for us as the inevitable result of conscription. In fact, it was a matter of common knowledge that the death of Emperor Franz Joseph was to be the signal for a simultaneous revolution in which all the races of Austria should seek freedom from the unity thus imposed upon them by conscription and force, and only the outbreak of the great war has prevented the disintegration of the Austria Empire. It may be that war has a unifying influence and that the Austrian Empire will be solidified by the terrible ordeal through which it is passing. That remains to be seen. But in any case, I do not understand the advocates of universal military service to be urging war as a remedy for the lack of unity in our national life. The history of Poland, of the subject races and nationalities of Russia, and of Turkey is a refutation of the claim that national unity can be secured by universal military service.

America needs unity, a national consciousness, and a national

will, but no reactionary, militaristic, obsolete, old world instrument, such as conscription, can unify the American people.

Patriotism

A fourth argument for universal military service is that it will promote patriotism, it will teach a man to be ready to sacrifice himself for others and to lay down his life for hiscountry, in the service of a great idea. The difficulty with this plan is that there are various kinds of patriotism and the tendency of militarism is to emphasize the wrong kind—the patriotism which corresponds to a narrow nationalism and to Jingoism and the patriotism which is based upon the hatred of other parts of the human race who happen to live the other side of a boundary line. Patriotism and nationalism of the wrong kind are defeating their own ends in Europe. For the sake of our country, as well as for humanity, we must develop another type of patriotism than universal military service has given us in Germany or any of the European countries, a patriotism which will look upon America as a part of the world and will take pride in the contributions which America can make to the family of nations. Independence for the sake of independence, a new nation merely that there might be one more army and navy in the world, was no part of the purpose of the founders of the Republic. As Henry Adams said of the great author of the Declaration of Independence:

> Jefferson aspired beyond the ambition of a nationality, and embraced in his view the whole future of man. That the United States should become a nation like France, England or Russia, or should conquer the world like Rome, was no part of his scheme. He wished to begin a new era. Hoping for a time when the world's ruling interests should cease to be local and should become universal; when questions of boundary and nationality should become insignificant; when armies and navies should be reduced to the work of police,—he set himself to the task of governing with this golden age in view . . . . . He would not consent to build up a new nationality merely to create more navies and armies, to be perpetuate the crimes and follies of Europe; the central government at Washington should not be permitted to indulge in the miserable ambitions that had made the Old World a hell and frustrated the hopes of humanity.

We need greatly a rebirth of true patriotism, just as we need a more fundamental democracy, deeper national unity, more self-dicipline, but universal military service is not the panacea for these ills. A true American patriotism can be created only by return to the great principles of the founders of the Republic, a new vision of America in the world, a great world task such as the establishment of a League to Enforce Peace, calling for the sacrifice of old

p ovincialisms and outworn traditions in the service of humanity, as a whole. In this way, under the great constructive leadership of a world statesman, America can be unified. Ii this way we may recover our vision of democracy and we may lead the world into a higher patriotism, purified in the very furnace of this world crisis. By these new paths which lead out into a future full of hope and service, it may be that in the coming years the soul of America will be born again into a new and larger life, but never by the path of conscription, of fear and servile obedience, and the mechanical methods of militarism.

A much deeper principle is involved than is usually discussed in connection with universal military service: What kind of a society do we wish to live in? For, if the principle of compulsion is accepted in the case of military service, it must logically be accepted for service in munition factories, on the railroads, in coal mines and in all the industrial and economic life upon which modern wars depend. In other words, once having granted the principle of compulsion on the ground of military necessity, all the fundamental principles of democracy must be sacrificed and our country must be "Prussianized" from within. Freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of assembly and freedom of the press are well opposed to military effectiveness and must disappear step by step if freedom of conscience, the advance trench of democracy, is carried by the militarists; for in the last analysis, universal military service means conscription of conscience.

The new political perseuction represented by the adoption of conscription differs from the old religious persecution in this: whereas, in the Middle Ages the heretic could save his life by keeping his mouth closed and his opinions to himself, in the modern political persecution of Twentieth Century militarism, the heretic who may believe an aggressive foreign policy is unjust, or a war which his country has declared is unprovoked, is compelled not only to keep his opinions to himself, but is forced to go out and kill his fellowmen against whom he may have no cause for enmity whatever.

America is the only great nation left in the world in which militarism is not enthroned and the principle of conscription established. In order to defend our institutions and our democracy from imaginary dangers from without, we are urged to surrender to this much more real and formidable enemy of militarism and conscription from within. Upon the outcome of the great debate on "Conscription vs. Democracy" depends the question of whether the last fortress of democracy in the world and the

greatest adventure in human history shall go down in failure. All patriotic Americans, all who believe that America has a mission and a great message of democracy to give to the world should enroll themselves in defense of America's freedom and domestic institutions presenting a united front against this attempt to militarize the whole American people.

Sometime in the future, if Europe remains an armed camp after this war, and if militarism is enthroned in the world, it may become inevitable for America to adopt conscription, and, in Jefferson's words "to penpetuate the crimes and follies of Europe", "to indulge in the miserable ambitions that had made the Old World a hell and frustrated the hopes of humanity." But if conscription ever does become inevitable, let us not add blasphemy to our other crimes by adopting militarism in the name of democracy. No, let us do it with the clear knowledge that we are dealing a death blow to the greatest experiment in democracy the human race has ever tried. Let us do itwith the consciousness that we have participated in a great world tragedy, and that, with the triumph of militarism in the New World as well as the Old, we shall have seen government of the people, by the people, and for the people, perish from the earth.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING
H. L. SCOTT, Chief of Staff, 1916.

Universal military training has been the corner stone upon which has been built every republic in the history of the world, and its abandonment the signal for decline and obliteration. This fact was fully recognized by the makers of our Constitution and evidenced in our early laws. A regular army was regarded as inconsistent with the principles of free government, dangerous to free institutions, and apart from the necessities of the times. All were imbued with a patriotism which would make them stand shoulder to shoulder in upholding the laws, and in the defense of the common country, sharing equally the blessings of peace and the hardships of war. The law required every able-bodied male between 18 and 45 years to keep himself provided with rifle and ammunition and to attend muster, and was in effect compulsory military service. They were called together for training at muster time only, for the outdoor life of the early settlers was considered sufficient training for any military duty they were then liable to be called upon to perform. Unfortunately the doctrine of States rights crept in to prevent the enforcement of Federal law.

and each State was left to build up its militia. The Regular Army existed as a small force to protect the western march of civilization from Indian foray, and notwithstanding its brilliant record, the attitude of a great mass of our people continued hostile to the soldier, so much so that several States and Congress have in recent times had to pass laws to insure respect to the uniform and its wearers in public places. Some of our States, while extending the right to vote to aliens of a few month's residence who have declared their intention to become citizens, deny it absolutely to persons in the military and navy service of the United States, putting them in a class with the criminal and insane.

It is vital that our ideas with reference to military service be regenerated. For our small army we go into the labor market for recruits. When the demand for labor is lax, the stipend of the soldier attracts; when the daily wage goes up, recruiting is at its lowest ebb. There is no appeal to patriotism, no appeal for the individual to obtain military training as the highest duty of his citizenship. Enlistment is held out as a job in which the individual gets small pay but is well cared for, with an outdoor, wholesome life and retirement on three-quarters pay and allowances after thirty years of service, and it is accepted as a job. This view was given added emphasis by the last session of Congress. The national defense act prohibits enlisted men from engaging in any civil occupations, whether for pay or otherwise, that would put them in competition with men in civil life. The fine quality of our enlisted men is due to the care in accepting recruits and to the development of character which service under the flag directed by competent leaders gives men, when the realization comes that their lives are committed to the upholding of the laws of the Union. The generally accepted idea that the annual per cent of desertions is a serious reflection upon the discipline and training in the Army is in serious error. The Army will show a smaller per cent of men leaving their contract and job than any business enterprise in the country. The annual return of civil life of thousands who have completed their enlistments with their views of life settled, to become successful citizens is a superb testimonial to the efficiency of the machine, as well as are the thousands who are inspired by the life as to take up the duty of a soldier as their vocation.

A few years ago we reached across the seas and assumed

reponsibilities of insular possessions and alien races. In the interest of advancing civilization we have built the Panama Canal. We have given a fiat to the world that on this hemisphere at least must survive the principle that rulers derive their just powers from the consent of the ruled. We claim an enlightened civilization of over a hundred million people and stand the richest country in the world. As a nation we are devoted to the peaceful vocationas of industrial and commercial life. We treat others as we desire to be treated. Few have knowledge of war and fewer still any training of its rigors. We are entering fully into the affairs of the world and as the greatest of nations we must be ready to uphold and protect our institutions.

It is fundamental with a free people that equal opportunities and protection under the law brings equal responsibility in upholding and maintaining the law. Each owes to the body politic his duty not only in civil affairs but also in the defense of the nation. But with us thousands have been inculcated with the belief that wars were to be ended and that the United States should, as the exponent of the highest civilization, set an example in a minimum military preparedness, and some even advocated the Army and Navy be disbanded. The country became apathetic in the training of its people for national defense. But the awful cauldron of war into which Europe was suddenly plunged has served to awaken us in a measure to a realization that we must believe in ourselves, and as the exponents of a democracy that should regenerate the political system of the world, we must be ready to hold our place in the councils of the world, and to do this we must be physically fit, or we shall be brushed aside by the vigorous manhood of other races who sacrifice self that the nation may live.

During the months of Many and June hundreds of thousands marched in socalled preparedness parades to the plaudits of onlookers. But when the militia was called out in June to protect our border, it was with the utmost difficulty that its units were recruited to the small number required, and some were never filled. The spirit was rife to let somebody else do it. Not only is there evidence of the volunteer spirit being moribund, but the States have for years been unable to make an efficient showing with the militia, even with the generous assistance of the General Government in qualified instructors and supplies. It would seem that the self-reliance

of the individual, like that of the States, had given way to dependence upon others. The fine volunteer spirit of the States militia was injured in the demand for Federal pay in time of peace. It sounded the knell of patriotic military training for individuals and commercialized the highest duty that a State can demand from its people. We have fallen away from the teaching of the Fathers, for there is no longer instilled into our people the fundamental doctrine that every man owes a military as well as a civil obligation to his government.

A young man between 18 and 21 is at the least earning capacity of his career. It is a time of anxiety to the parent and uncertainty for the son. During these years few settle into their life's vocation. They are an expense to their parents; their average earnings will not pay for their board and clothes. They can be given military training without the slightest disruption of business. The stabilizing effect of military discipline and intensive training upon such young men would be of utmost value in forming character, and thereby a foundation for their life's work. They would become an asset of incalcuable value to the nation, not only in time of emergency, but in the recruitment to industrial life of the thousands returned from military pursuits improved mnetally, morally, and physically by the training. The hundreds of military schools in the country are evidence of the faith of thousands of parents that their boys are better fitted for the responsibilities of life by the elementary discipline and drills therein received. The most important function of our regular establishment should be to make it a real training school for our young men, and thereby inspire them with the spirit of patriotism and sense of duty and responsibility with which each generation must be imbued if we are to continue our high mission as a nation.

I shall not attempt in this report to evolve a system to carry out so important a work. It is believed that the average parent would gladly welcome the opportunity for military training for their boys between the ages of 18 and 21. As the training would be educational, there should be no remuneration for service, but the Government should stand all the expense.

If we are to continue to compete with the wage of labor for our soldiers the cost will be enormous if we are to get the men. We hire police, we hire firemen, but there is a

repugnance to the idea that we must continue to commit ourselves to no military resource other than that of hiring citizens to accept military training and to commit our future to such inadequate defense.

The justice of, as well as the necessity for, universal training is recognized in section 79 of the national defense act, which prescribes that in time of war, "If for any reason there shall not be enough voluntary enlistments to keep the reserve battalions at the prescribed strength, a sufficient number of the unorganized militia shall be drafted into the service of the United States to maintain each such battalion at the proper strength." This provision is intended to keep the National Guard units that have been sent into the field at war strength and is one of the best provisions regarding the National Guard in the bill. What I am contending for is that the principle recognized as applying to time of war should apply equally to time of peace, so that all of the youth of the country who are physically qualified for military service should be given thorough military training and discipline under competent officers, and noncommissioned officers, so that on the outbreak of war they will be able without much additional training to render efficient service. To send men into battle who have not been given this thorough training and discipline is not only a useless waste of our resources in men but, to anyone who understands anything of the realities of modern war, convicts the people of the country who are responsible for such proceeding of criminal neglect.

MILITARY TRAINING IN THE MAKING OF MEN

FREDERICK J. LIBBY

(Note: Arguments as to the value of universal military training for making men are being vigorously pressed today as to require us to take notice of the effort now being made in certain influential quarters to fasten upon us a permanent policy of conscription after the war. We must especially be on our guard against the danger of arguing from the apparent consequences of the selective draft in time of war to the probable consequences of that system in time of peace. Obviously in war time there is an idealism and devotion that go far to transform the drudgery, autocracy and mechanical rigidity of the military machine. The writer of this article deals only with conscription as a permanent policy and not with the wisdom of the selective draft in time of war.)

Those who advocate the adoption of universal military training as a permanent policy for the United tSates have not

based their contention solely on the necessity of building up a powerful military machine, a question which the outcome of our "war to end war" may settle forever. They have advanced also certain claims as to the value of military training in the making of men which have gained apparently wide acceptance.

It has been affirmed first that military training includes patriotism, secondly that it teaches obedience, third, that it fosters democracy, and fourth that it develops the physical well-being of youth. Inasmuch as our youth need more patriotism, more obedience, more democracy ,and better physique, many Americans would be willing to give military training a permanent place in the new world order if they were assured that it is the best teacher of these great virtues. Consequently, speeches upon the subject have been largely taken up with the presentation of these virtues as by-products of a military system. That they are important could not be disputed; and that they are by-products of military training has been accepted almost without discussion by the unthinking American public. Let us consider them one by one and see how far they bear scrutiny.

Does Military Training Make Good Patriots

First of all, does military training inculcate patriotism? From the confidence with which this assertion has been put forward one would suppose that it cannot be denied. In a superficial sense it does inculcate patriotism. The recent draft has made men who never before had been conscious of their obligation to America realize that they were its citizens and that as citizens they owe their country a debt. Poles, Lithuanians, Englishmen, Germans, Italians, Greeks, all have been forced to choose between conflicting loyalties and to confess their true allegience. Outwardly, at least, they have renounced all nationalities except that which made them Americans. Those between twenty-one and thirty-one have entered the army. This sacrifice, itis assumed, has transformed all who were indifferent into patriots.

Now it is probable that such a transformation has taken place in very many instances, but it must not be forgotten that this was in time of war. The newspapers of the country have united to impress upon the minds of the doubtful the urgency of the need. But remove the urgency, let peace once more descend upon us, and is it supposed that this forced

Americanism would have similar results? Is it not well known that hundreds of thousands of our immigrants left their native lands through hatred of this very service? They hated it because in time of peace it seemed to them an unwarrantable interference with their normal lives. Clearly in them it did not at that time breed patriotism. It led to their expatriation. They preferred to become exiles from home forever rather than submit to it. Consequently, is it not safe to conclude that in a time of universal peace the great majority of the American people would not give cheerful service to a country whose urgent need of it they failed to see? In the case of many, military training would kindle not patriotism, but the fires of discontent.

Quite as serious an objection to military training as a teacher of patriotism is found in the narrowness of the patriotism that it engenders. I am not sure that it even deserves the name of patriotism in the twentieth century. It is rather a jealous, tribal sensitiveness, an intense nationalism which verges on arrogance. The military patriot becomes suddenly punctilious about "national honor" defined in medieval terms. Jostle me and you must fight me, provoke me and I will take your life. This spirit is fertile soil for breeding international suspicion. This is the patriotism that fosters war. It tends to destroy the very nation that it swears to defend, a fact to which Germany today bears eloquent witness.

Now true patriotism, I take it, is a broad and comprehensive virtue. It is constructive. It is intelligent. It seeks to promote the welfare of the State in all its complex life. Farmer, factory worker, financier, boy scout, and college professor, miner and poet and preacher, cartoonist, and nurse, all serve the State within their vocations, and without military training they have been proving their patriotism. More than this, is not the true patriot active in the public service outside of his vocation? The conscientious use of the ballot is the least of his obligations as a citizen. His bank account and his time alike will always be at the command of the State in so far as his means will allow. If desirable public improvements demand a higher tax rate, the patriot will pay it cheerfully. He will accept public office as a public trust, and far from seeking private profit in so doing, he will avoid scrupulously even the appearance of fraud or simony.

This larger patriotism military training has never in-

culcated. We have never asked that it should even try to teach it. Who has ever expected a soldier to pay his taxes more willingly than a civilian does? Who expects him to show in civil life the humble, earnest spirit in which he entered the army—as one who gives, not one who gets? Who expects him to set a lifelong example of disinterested public service? One has but to recall the history of pension legislation to perceive that the soldier can learn a kind of patriotism which does not cover his life as a civilian. A brave man will die for his country, but he must have many other virtues besides bravery if he will live for it; and it is the sum of these virtues that we may call the twentieth century patriotism.

Nor can love for America on the part of our immigrant population be taught by soldiering. The world is so constituted as to admit of no short cuts. There is only one way to make an immigrant love America. He must find America lovable. An exploited Pole will not be made a patriot by marching him up and down. A garment worker who is always hungry needs proper wages to make him feel patriotic. Conditions in the factory and the mine must breed in our immigrants love for the country of their adoption or they will soon be found among the rebels, made by military training only the more dangerous. True, they may be cowed into subservience for a while, they may be kept under by methods which we have come to associate with Prussianism, but loyal and free Americans they will never be. America at her best means liberty, opportunity, democracy, brotherhood, service. Only he who has found these has reached the true America. Only he who is experiencing here an unwonted richness of life will feel the patriotic fervor which we should like every newcomer to our shores to know.

Does Military Training Teach Obedience?

Secondly, does military training teach obedience? Here again the unthinking answer is that the question admits of no controversy. Surely, if military training teaches anything, it teaches obedience. From dawn to dawn, whether in camp or out of it, the soldier is made aware of the inexorable power of the military machine. To it he must yield or he will be crushed under it. It knows no mercy and shows no favors. It is as inflexible as Death. How, then, it is asked, can a boy pass through this machine and fail to learn obedience?

Yes, he learns it,—that is, most boys do,—although the prisons and guardhouses betray its failure with an appreciable number. But what kind of obedience does he learn? Is it not a kind that enlightened public sentiment has rejected from both school and home probably forever? Even those who regard as a golden age the time when father and schoolmaster were absolute monarchs and maintained their authority with rod and cane, do not seriously look for its return. It was part of a system of blind obedience resting on brute force which free men everywhere are challenging. The reduction of men to unthinking, irresponsible, automatic machines has value only for certain military purposes. From every other point of view such discipline is the exact opposite of what is generally regarded as desirable. Were this not the case, why should we stop with a little military training for our young men? Should we not all live better under martial law? Belgium knows the answer.

Does Military Training Make Good Citizens?

In the third place, militarism is said to foster democracy. It has been described as "the great leveller." Rich and poor are forced to sleep in the same tent, the refined and the vulgar to march shoulder to shoulder, and presto! democracy has arrived! This blind juxtaposition of the uncongenial we admit to be a feature of the life of the rank and file under military compulsion. We grant even more. Mother's darling at camp will get the sugar only after his messmates at the table have licked their spoons and dipped them into it. Cleanliness and health of body and mind will be inevitably exposed to the contagion of that which is vicious and unclean. No, it cannot be denied that military service in the ranks will prove a great leveller.

This does not establish, however, the democracy of military training. The usual difference in the status of the educated and the uneducated, of the rich and the poor, of the socially "superior" and the socially "inferior' obtains just as much in the army as in any other profession. College men, for instance can always rise from "democracy" in which they find themselves by studying for commissions. Moreover, the "paper work," the figuring, etc., required of commissioned officers is now so exacting that it is not easy in these days for privates ever to be promoted to the coveted positions higher up.

Only the self-deceived and the foolish would look for democracy in the most rigid type of aristocracy known to man. The commander of an army, even under the most favorable conditions, is necessarily an autocrat, in comparison with whom the Czar of all the Russias wielded a wooden scepter. In time of war, he crowds even God from his throne, abrogates civil and moral laws, and becomes, to his army, mind, will, and even conscience. Below him in descending scale his officers share his absolutism. What place, then, in a military machine is there for democracy?

Nor can it be claimed that even if all were to be privates, the army would offer the only place where widely separated classes of American society can meet. A doctor's profession brings him into close touch with rich and poor and high and low, and gives him better opportunity really to know men than does the loose talk of the barracks. What is true of medicine is true of the law, the ministry ,business, engineering, politics, and many other forms of civil activity. They offer better opportunities of knowing one's fellows on sides worth knowing than does military training under peace conditions. The limits to the breadth of almost any reputable civilian's acquaintance are time and inclination, and this will be increasingly true as we democratize our industrial life.

Does Military Training Insure Good Health?

In the fourth place, military training is said to develop men physically. After the testimony which our drafted men have brought home in their own persons, it cannot be denied that military training has improved the health and physique of the vast majority of its recipients under the recent draft. Outdoor life with several hours of exercise will work wonders though all the laws of hygiene be disregarded, and though the exercise taken be the poorest that could be chosen. This is true especially if only picked men are to be recipients of the training and those who need it most can be disregarded. No one will deny that outdoor life is beneficial, but will any one affirm that military drill is the healthiest form of outdoor life?

Dr. Dudley Sargent, director of the Harvard gymnasium, has proven the manual of arms to offer none of the essential elements of a good physical exercise. The training it gives is one-sided, it lacks interest—at any rate in times of peace—it does not quicken adequately the respiration or the circula-

tion of the blood, it requires identically the same of all, it impairs the tone of the muscles by prolonged tension, it has little or no value as training for the central nerve system, and it offers slight opportunity for the display of coolness, courage, judgment, and presence of mind, for struggle, and cooperation, and loyalty, qualities all of which are fostered on the other hand by our national sports. Probably time could not be spent out of doors in any conceivable form af activity that would be productive of so little physical good as that which is devoted to military drill, using the term in the restricted sense.

Regarding other features of up-to-date military training such as the bayonet drill and trench construction, it is only fair to say that they furnish the strong with excellent means of further physical development. Little account, however, can be made in the inflexible system of the army of differences between individuals. Within roughly fixed limits, all are forced to undergo the same physical strain day after day provided they are well enough to be out of bed. Nowhere else in modern life is blind rigidity of requirement combined with a severity that exacts the full pound of flesh even from the strong.

One more factor in the situation cannot be ignored, and that is the effect of military training may fairly be expected to have upon the physique of the soldiers after their return to civil life. Suppose, for example, that a mill-hand after living outof doors for six months or a year returns to the confinement of his former life for ten or even eight hours a day. Is it not likely that after a few week either he will abandon the mill and be lost to the industry that needs him, or that he will gradually fall back into the unhealthly rut from which he was temporarily withdrawn and be really worse off than before? As a practical measure would not the shortening of the working day of all factory workers to a maximum of eight hours with a great extension of the garden movement, of sunset baseball leagues, of park and playground, for the months when men and boys can be out of doors, and of municipal gymnasium privileges and swimming pools for winter use do more to improve their health permanently than a year in the army, even assuming, what is by no means promised, that nearly all of them would be able to pass its physical examinations and get in? If it is believed that this important matter of physical health cannot be left to individual initiative but

must be assured by another of the rapidly increasing State regulations, would not a great industrial army digging sewers and irrigation ditches instead of trenches, building roads and bridges instead of barbed wire entanglements, and practicing forestry from the scientific rather than the military viewpoint, without the injurious and wasteful military drill, offer all the physical benefits accruing from army life and at the same time escape its inherent evils?

The Summing Up

Military training, like State socialism, would fain be considered the cure of all our nation's ills. No such panacea exists. That our boys need better physique, and better habits of obedience, and more democracy, and sounder patriotism may readily be admitted. How to lift them to this higher plane of living despite the downward pull of inertia and selfishness is a question that has not yet been adequately answered. It will not be solved by any program. It is a spiritual program and no mechanical device will meet it. Education and inspiration will solve it, but their effectiveness depends upon the sincere cooperation of all Americans. Patriotism, for example, can be taught by the school and the press, but the factory and the mine also must engender it. In fostering intelligent obedience no substitute can replace the home and the school, but they need to be supplemented by wise factory foremen and by constituted authority in all walks of life working along democratic, not autocratic lines, Democracy is one of the fundamental Christian virtues and as such it cannot be forced upon men by mere contiguity. To be real it must be of the heart. In our public school system and in the ordinary intercourse of our business, professional and social life, we have abundant opportunity to be as democratic as we want to be. Patriotism demands that we enter into our opportunity. With regard to the physical development of our youths there is no doubt that much more pains should be taken in the public schools. Every child ought to be given a sound body as well as a reasonable mental equipment before he finishes his school days. To what age the State should keep its hand upon him to compel him to maintain a high grade of physical efficiency, future experience will have to determine.

It is probably reliance on a specious materialistic philosophy that is the cause of the collapse of the whole argument

for military training in the making of men. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, sayeth the Lord of hosts."—by His spirit transmitted through man to man, and through men to boys,—only so can the America of our dreams find realization.

DEMOCRACY AND SERVICE ARE INSEPARABLE

By Lieutenant General S. B. M. Young, U. S. A.

In countries where universal military service is employed, universal military training becomes part of the education of the citizen. Where such service does not prevail, as in the United States, dependence has been placed on the National Guard and volunteers. Therefore, in time of peace, the profession of the army is regarded by our citizens as a trade by which a livelihood is earned.

Since the commencement of the Mexican border troubles and the European War, universal military training is receiving so much favor from the very best men in the land that we may look forward to its adoption, some time in the near future, as the only proper military policy for the protection of the country. This nation, by its fathers, was dedicated to the proposition that "Democracy and service are inseparable."

A democracy which does not identify itself with its army and navy and which refuses to train itself for its own defense is traveling on a dangerous trail.

Upon a citizenry trained to arms rests the power of the nation to resist invasion.

Every young man in America should be compelled to take sufficient military training to make him efficient for national defense, and, at the same time, teach him physical hygiene, application of sanitary science, discipline, and respect for authority. By "military training" I do not mean simply the manual of arms, target shooting, company and regimental drills and field maneuvers, but all those other and superior things which go to make thorough and complete military training of mind and body. The physical benefit to be derived from such military instruction is incalculable and is alone worth all it may cost.

The charge has been made that we are losing our national ideals and that we have forgotten how to obey—if we ever knew. If we are to overcome the onus of these charges, we must do so through training of our young men in the ideals which have been handed down to us from an ancestry which was willing to fight for them, sacrifice for them, and when need arose, die for them.

They died that we might rest secure, as we have rested secure for many generations. If we value this sacred heritage, we must qualify to answer the call of our country and answer it fully equipped for the task.

We are exerting every effort and expending huge sums in order that the citizen of the future may be better trained for his duties than they are or ever have known.

Military Training Is Democratic

The elbow touch is the thing most needed to prevent class tendencies, and I know of no finer influence against this tendency than that supplied through military training. It also teaches the young men in all stations that the government is not an agency from which something is to be had, but an institution with first claim on them for the best they have to give. I do not believe we can ever make real men or real citizens by endeavoring to give our people something they have not earned.

Then, again, can there be any doubt of the truly democratic ideal of the proposal that every young man should prepare himself to a reasonable degree of efficiency to defend his country? Class feeling will gradually disappear before an ideal founded on service to the state by all classes. In no other way may we hope to fuse together the widely different elements of our population and instill into them the conviction that this is indeed a nation.

Work for the Women

With reference to the inclusion of girls in any scheme of universal military training for the national service, attention is invited to the increasinglylarge number of girls receiving vocational training throughout the country and also to the fact that large numbers of girls and women are fast qualifying for agricultural pursuits.

All these activities of the women folk are steps in the right direction for national service for the womanhood of the nation. As women cannot bear arms, any scheme adding military training to the other large opportunities for boys should contemplate an increase in the vocational pursuits for girls.

The natural corollary to universal military training is equal service. The duty—and it is a dutyof the first importance—of national defense is an equal obligation upon all citizens—women as well as men—and unless this duty shall be assumed and discharged along lines of absolute equality, the structure of democracy will not endure. We do not desire a large army in America. I mean by

this what is known as a "regular" or "professional" army, but we do want to know that we can assemble the units—evenly balanced—of all arms of the service, and assemble them quickly when needed.

With this foundation firmly laid in the national life, we may build the superstructure to suit the exigencies of each moment of stress and, through experience, remodel it again and again, or tear it away and build anew, and still the force arising from the bed-rock foundation of universal military training would endure, and would be found to meet every possible strain—for it is the only elastic system and the only one which can ever become a permanent success in a democracy.

Our regular army ,though numbering less than one-fourth of the mobile force necessary for our great country, has always been efficient for the work assigned it to do and has been an exemplar to the militia and the volunteer forces called into the service. It has trusted in God and kept its powder dry. It has, in the last analysis, evidenced a consistent belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and has accomplished results of infinite value to mankind.

Wealth and Weakness

We have become rich and ease loving; weakness and wealth always have been and undoubtedly always will be; we are open to attack, and therefore in great danger of a national disaster unless we succeed in awakening the great majority of our citizens, and especially our lawmakers, to a thorough realization of the menace of our weakened condition.

With military training for one year with the colors for all our physically fit boys between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one and coordinate training of our young women, and a standing army of 250,000, we may look forward from our past to our future with confidence that officers and men of both the regular and citizen army will acquit themselves with credit and with honor to their country, which stands for liberty, progress and the individuality of man.

I believe that out of universal military training and equal service will arise a new America—consecrated to the preservation of national honor, international righteousness, and universal peace.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING
OUR LATEST CURE-ALL

by

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
New York Evening Post

A Delegate-How about universal military training after the war?

Mr. Lloyd George—It is my hope, and that is really what we are fighting for, that we shall establish conditions that will make compulsory service unnecessary, not merely in this country, but in every country. Unless we succeed in establishing those conditions, I personally shall not feel that we have achieved one of the most important of our war aims.

(London Times, January 19, 1918, account of conferences with trade union delegates.)

In the years to come, none of the recent amazing phenomena will, I am sure, cause greater wonderment than our recent discovery that universal military service is the cure-all for every one of our American ills. Do we wish to defend our country? We have but to adopt the system of training every boy to be a soldier, and the problem is solved. Do we wish to become industrially efficient? Then let us forget all about vocational training, but give every American a year under arms, and presto! we shall outdo Germany in scientific efficiency and management. Are our youth lawless and undisciplined? Universal compulsory service will end that once for all. Is our democracy halting? It is the tonic of a democratic army that we need in which all men shall pay for the privileges of citizenship by a year of preparation for poison gas and of learning how to destroy other human beings. Our melting-pot is a failure? Then let us pour into it the iron of militarism, and it will fuse every element at once. Finally, if we need an American soul-and the war has suddenly taught as that this glorious country lacks a soul!—it is the remedy of universal military service that is to supply our spiritual needs and give us the ability to feel as one, to think as one, to steer towards our destiny as of one mind, imperialistically.

It is so alluring and so entrancingly easy, the wonder is that we have never thought of it before. We saw it going on in France and Germany and Russia, but it seemed altogether repulsive in its forms. Americans to be conscripted? Heaven forbid. There rose before us the unutterable cruelties of non-commissioned officers and some of the officers—visions of the thousands of men coming to our shores with hands mutilated to avoid the barracks with their open immoralities their bitter hardships, the loss of three years of so many working lives. The "Red Rosa," Rosa

Luxemburg, with her 10,000 authenticated instances of cruelties to German soldiers, inflicted by their own countrymen behind the screen of official authority, explained to us why so many young Germans emigrated before becoming of military age. In speaking of the case of one soldier horribly abused at Metz, the "Red Rosa" declared: "It is certainly one of those dramas which are enacted day in and day out in German barracks, although the groans of the actors never reach our ears." When the German army sought to prosecute her it was announced that she would cal 1,000 eyewitnesses to grievous abuses of military authority in Germany's "democratic" army, but she went to jail none the less.

(This particular case against her was abandoned by the prosecution. Editor.)

II

In Germary, of course, universal service is not in the least democratic, save that all must serve. Upon that we can surely all agree. The autocracy rules the army, and the aristocracy is fortressed by it. More than one debate in the Reichstag has been enlivened by the bitter attacks by bourgeois orators against the favoritism shown to the Imperial Guards and to other fashionable regiments. There is even a caste within a caste, for men through the gymnasia need serve but one year. Those whose fathers are too poor to educate them thus must give two years of their lives carrying arms. The spirit of arrogance and aristocracy which the military life, with its medieval code of honor, fosters, is about as anti-democratic as anything in the world. When men, merely by reason of the coat they wear, deem themselves sacrosanct and especially priviliged, even to the extent of running their swords through civilizans by whom they fancy themselves insulted, or by preparing to turn their machine-guns upon their civilian fellow-townsmen, as in Zabern, it is obviously to contend that the system of which they are the products smacks, save in the remotest, of anything democratic.

And never, save in Russia, was there a better illustration of the truth of our own James Madison's saying that "large armies and heavy taxes are the best-known instruments for bringing the many under the dominion of the few." General von Falkenhayn, the present Chief of Staff and War Minister, was not altogether far from the truth when he said that but for the army "not a stone of the Reichstag building would remain in place," provided we assume that he meant to typify by the Reichstag building the present form of government in Berlin. No one need look further than the Russian system of universal service for a complete reason for

the failure of the first Russian revolution of this century. The truth is that men of noble spirit are in every land crushed by the whole system of compulsory military labor precisely as compulsory servitude deadens men's souls everywhere.

And those Americans who see in the French army a perfect model for ourselves would do well to forget neither the shocking revelations of graft which have come to light before and since the war, nor the depths of infamy sounded by the military in the Dreyfus case, nor the fact that General Boulanger came within an ace of upsetting the Republic he had taken oath to preserve. But, we are told, Australia is democratic, quite like ourselves, and Australia has dedicated its youth to a training in arms with much resultant good in the present campaign. Why should we not be like Australia? Surely, there is no militarism there. And look at Switzerland! Does it not point the way? Well, so far as the latter is concerned, it does not. There is no comparison whatever between a little homogenous country of about four millions-homogenous despite the use of three languages—with a small and extremely mountainous country to defend, and our own vast continent.

But in one respect, the Swiss system does set an admirable example to the United States: It allows no general to exist save after the declaration of war. Its highest officer is a colonel. No major-generals parade the country urging "preparedness"; no brigadiers bewail the terrible fate that will overtake Switzerland if her standing force is not doubled at once. Yet even in Switzerland, if report be true, there is an anti-army party, people who complain that their military business has become ominous ever since so many of the younger officers have been serving in the German army and become inbued with the spirit of the Prussian General Staff, just as, according to a prominent Australian, speaking in a public meeting in London a few months ago, the feeling against conscription of boys was so intense in Australia that the law compelling this servitude would have been repealed had not the war come just when it did. Perhaps the fact that in fifteen years some 22,000 Australian boys have been punished for refusal to perform military service, or for minor infractions of discipline, a large proportion by jail sentences, may have had something to do with the growing feeling against it. As to its merits, there is as much difference of military opinion in regard to its work, as is to be found in regard to the value of our own military forces.

III

But let us grant for the sake of argument that there is solid

worth in the Australian and Swiss systems and less militaristic danger than under any other. Would the same hold true with us? Australia is but a colony, unable to make war by itself, controlled and protected by the power of the mother country's fleet. Switzerland, by her geographical and ethnic situation and the scarcity of her numbers, cannot dream of wars of conquest. She is not a world power. She has no colonies, or oversea entanglements, or foreign alliances. How different is our situation! We have powerful military cliques, great aggregations of capital seeking outlet abroad and engineered by the same groups of priviliged citizens who have been behind the Six-Power Chinese loan, who desire to exploit the Phillipines for our own benefit, who have set up in Nicaragua a government upheld to-day only by American bayonets, who desire commercially to conquer the remainder of the hemisphere. We have seen outbursts of jingo passion in 1849 and 1898 marked by the stealing of other people's lands. The universal arming of the nation—what would it not mean in another such period of excitement under the rule of conscienceless and time-serving legislators, or administrators, or by generals gone into politics, with eyes ken only for a nation's aggrandisement and viewing every question from the standpoint of a soldier!

History shows us clearly what it all might mean. Leaving aside the fate of the ancient republics, should we not recall what happened to the new-born French Republic? The nation rushed to arms, and out of the hurly-burly emerged the imperial figure which became the scourge of Europe. Such was the sudden transformation of a nation that but a few years before was imbued with the spirit of liberty, fraternity, and equality, whose doctrine did permeate all Europe to its very lasting betterment. But this tide of good-will, this spirit of universal brotherhood, was conquered by the militaristic spirit and militarism until it became, not the great leavening, leveling influence it should have become, but a menace for all the world against which all the nations of Europe were compelled to unite. Now we Americans, of course, think that nothing of the kind can happen to us—that we merely seek peace and defend our own. Is it utterly without significance that our most distinguished Rear Admiral goes up and down the country preaching that the American flag shall be carried at once to Cape Horn; that every republic to the south of us shall be conquered? Does it mean nothing that the Navy League demands that we shall take what they call "our rightful share of oversea trade" and seize upon land which has not already been preempted by other strong nations for colonies for the United States? Is it not true we

are already extending our government over the Caribbean by force of bayonets?

We have one hundred millions of people; we have neighbors on our borders whom we could easily crush if we chose. To the south of us a score of republics fear every military move we make. It is an historic fact that even before the war in Europe the menace of our rapidly growing fleet was urged in the Reichstag, in the British and Japanese Parliaments, as the reason for further increase of their naval armaments. Any introduction of universal military servitude in the Western world would send a chill over the entire American continent and be viewed with alarm by the rest of the world.

IV

Assuming that we are going to think of nobody else, and to blind our eyes to the obvious effects abroad of our arming—what does universal service mean? If it is to be for one year, fully seven hundred thousand young men will be annually withdrawn from productive labor; if it is to be for two years, and on the German model, our standing army would be at least a million four hundred thousand, or nearly double that of Germany in 1914. It would mean so vast machinery of control and discipline that no other department could compare with it in expense or in the multitude of its permanent employes. Has any one in America who is advocating universal service yet computed the cost, direct or indirect, to the nation? If so, I have not seen it. Even on the dilettante Swiss and Australian basis, it would be stupendous. If carried out under federal supervision, it would enormously increase our most favored class of citizens—our military and naval servants —and their pension rolls. Abroad the conscripts receive only a few cents a day for their service, which is practically unpaid (in Turkey, even in war time, the soldier gets but twenty-five cents a month.) Would our American youth stand for this when our National Guard has just now, by skillful political influence, succeeded in getting itself on the federal pay-roll—the first time that men have been so paid, yet remained important political factors in civil life? But we need have less concern with the financial cost and the creation of a dangerous military caste and the terrible burden of taxation than with the indirect results.

For what those do not see who feel that universal service is what we need to make patriots by the million is that the spirit of universal servitude, whether Australian, German, or Swiss, makes directly against the American ideal, for it inculcates blind obedience to the will of others, subordination to those who are masters,

not necessarily because of superior wisdom or fitness, but largely because of accident. Heretofore we have always valued the American's self-assertiveness—yes, his refusal to recognize masters, his independence of thought and action, his mental alertness, particularly the happy-go-lucky Yankee initiative and individuality, as some of his best characteristics. We hated the servile obedience of the foreigner. Indeed our whole American experiment was founded as a protest against certain tendencies abroad akin to those we are now asked to make dominant by means of universal service. The manhood of our western pioneers, the daring spirit of those who conquered the wilderness were our admiration. They might verge on the lawless at times, but militarism gave them nothing and could add nothing to their virile courage and their ability to take care of themselves. Now we are to prefer all men cast in one mould, drilled into one way of thinking, and taught blind obedience to those set above them. Formerly, we deemed it most worth while that all men should have their own opinions, express them freely, and if their consciences dictate, differ with their rulers if they saw fit. The principle of voluntary military service is directly connected with the principle of freedom of conscience which led to the foundation of Massachusetts and of Pennsylvania. Universal conscription, however disguised, by whatever foreign name it is characterized, makes against freedom of conscience and drives men into intellectual slavery.

Take the education of our boys. Recently, at a joint meeting of schoolmasters' associations, there were divided views on some issues, but none apparently as to the utter lawlessness of our American youth and the complete failure of our private schools to reduce them to subordination by means of mental and moral discipline. And so there were many who grasped with joy at the universal military-drill idea to retrieve for them the ground lost by their own failure to do the fundamental thing they pledged themselves to accomplish. Of course, they knew little or nothing about universal service; perhaps it was the unexplored mystery of it that appealed. Many Americans are quite sure that the latest untried remedy, be it some law, or the initiative and referendum, or the recall of judicial dicisions, or some other panacea, is, by reason of its very newness, just the medicine for a given ill they have been looking for. So with these school teachers. Ignoring the fact that our private military schools have been anything but popular, and, only in exceptional cases, of high standing, they turn military drill as to a last straw. But some of them do not even stop there; they want everybody subjected to military service.

They forget that to some of their boys enforced military training may be as poison, and do not inquire whether they are not suddenly exalting the physical above the intellectual. The only thing that stands out about it is that they, too, confessing themselves and their judgment failures heretofore, are now ready to take a leap into the dark.

V

Advocates of military preparedness are fond of likening their policies to the insurance policy upon our edifices. But there is a point beyond which no man would increase his premiums upon any given premises; he would tear them down to get a lower rate on a more modern structure, or he would build a concrete structure and do away with insurance altogether. So the price of universal military servitude is far too great a price to pay for insuring peace by any free peoples. Its dangers, its contaminating effects, the terrible weapon it forges for rulers, its reducing men to a dead level, far offset the alleged advantages which are physical betterment, greater practical efficiency and energy, and a sense of responsibility to the nation. For all of these things the price of compulsory service is too heavy. For it does not train the unfit or build up the weak, and it is not meant or intended to increase efficiency in civil life. Its primary purpose is to turn out killers, not workers. It often destroys those it would benefit—no less than ten thousand three hundred Germans conscripts have committed suicide in the last thirty years, or at the rate of one a day. There was a time when the price of social order was that human beings should go armed all the time, when they lived and ate and slept with their weapons by their sides. Humanity was deemed to have advanced itself from this stage until the present time has seen a return to it in the conscript armies of Europe. Surely, if the price of each man's carrying arms against another was too great to pay, the social cost of arming every man in a nation against all the men of other nations is wholly beyond reason in the present age. The answer to the world's difficulties is not the old destructive reactionary policy of arming to the teeth, but of so building our national edifices and so relating them one to the other that we can at once by mutual organization of nations reduce the premiums to a minimum or wipe them out altogether by building a concrete fireproof structure of internationalism—equipped with such lightning rods as world courts and international parliaments, and, if needs must be, an international police force of volunteers.

What to-day—what single thing—would most quickly win for Germany anew the good will of the world and make possible the

immediate coming of peace abroad? What else but an announcement by Germany that hereafter she would forever abandon universal military service? The chief menace of her militarism, against which all the world is roused, would disappear over-night.

No, to lead the world aright, the United States ought not to be debating to-day whether it prefers voluntary military training or conscription, but how rapidly it can induce the other nations by precept, by example, by enlightened leadership, to limit all armaments to the dimensions of police forces. Fortunately, there is evidence in every land that the world is to be different place when the soldiers return from the trenches.

"Compulsory military service is, therefore, unwise and absolutely incompatible with our institutions. We must depend upon voluntary enlistments for the making of our armies. Our service must be sufficiently remunerative, beneficial and attractive to draw men."

SELF-PRESERVATION HIGHEST LAW

Military Training League of America

The supreme law of life is self-preservation. This applies not only to the individual but to the state. There can be no progress, no civilization, no moral or spiritual development, nor any of the essentials that make for the welfare of the individual and the up-building of the state, which does not rest on the law of self-preservation.

This law carries with it the duty of being prepared for defense. It is the paramount duty of every man to protect his home and to help protect his country. This law holds to-day and its truth has been recognized in all ages and by all peoples.

Turn to the first chapter of Numbers in the Old Testament and you will find that God commanded Moses to list all men of fighting strength, of twenty years and older of various tribes.

In the New Testament we find: "And he said unto them, But now he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a wallet; and he that hath none, let him sell his cloak, and buy a sword." Luke, Chapter 22-36.

"When the strong man fully armed guardeth his own court, his goods are in peace; but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him his whole armor wherein he trusted and divideth his spoils." Luke, chapter 11; 21-22.

There is in no country in the world a more earnest desire for peace than that in the United States. Now war of aggression would never receive the support of public sentiment; therefore, we need not fear such a war. **War is often forecd upon a people.** We have several recent examples of it. The weaker a country's defense and the greater its wealth, the more probability there will be of attack. There is nothing truer than that in strength lies safety and in weakness lies **danger.**

War today is a highly specialized art and one in which untrained men count for little. Defensive military action must depend upon trained men in the ranks and highly skilled officers in command. Universal military training **will produce the one and stimulate the production of the other.**

Sources of Danger

The world is growing smaller year by year. It took our grandfathers from three weeks to three months to cross the Atlantic; our time is five days. International relations are becoming complicated and there are more sources of danger now than existed even a generation ago.

We have by a narrow margin so far (March 1917) kept out of the European war, but as President Wilson recently said :"With the world on fire, and sparks flying every where, we know not what a day may bring forth." He certainly is in a position to know. The enormous naval program undertaken by our government should satisfy any one that **there is substantial ground for alarm.**

Out of the European war our country has made the most extraordinary gain in wealth in the wordl's history. While European nations have been burning up wealth, we have been reaping an enormous harvest from their misfortunes. They have become envious, so no matter whether judged rightly or wrongly, **as a nation today we have few friends.**

The following dispatch which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on February 14, from its well-known London correspondent, Edward Price Bell, is illuminating:

"London, February 14, How any American citizen can be so blind to the vital interests of his country at this moment as to oppose thorough going measures of preparedness is unintelligible to persons in close touch with the European situation, German statesmen, admirals and generals regard America, though technically neutral, as an ally of the entente, and that they will severely punish her if they get an

opportunity is believed to be certain."

"Americans abroad easily can understand why the American nation should wish to keep out of the war if possible, particularly since its neutrality, owing to the naval position, operates advantageously for the cause of freedom. But these Americans cannot understand that there should be any opposition in the United States to the most rapid and thorough preparation possible to insure the security of the country against every menace, **now or later.**

"It is painfully evident to the best minds in London that international peace based on agreement is a long way off. It is felt there is in the future more than one disturbing possibility from the point of view of democracy and the realization is steadily becoming sharper that some method of consolidating the strength of the democratic nations must be discovered if free civilization is not to run the greatest risk of destruction."

Here we are, by all odds, the richest nation in the world, and we are practically without defense worthy of the name. We are soft, rich and flabby. Military experts agree that as matters stand, any one of a half-dozen nations could land large and seasoned armies, upon our shores, capture our sea board cities and levy and collect tribute to their heart's content. There would be nothing new in this. Such expeditions have been in practice the world over for a thousand years. Is it safe to assume human nature has so changed that we are immune?

It is common knowledge that we have been on the verge of a war with Germany several times and the situation is growing worse daily. Do not assume that when the European war is over the nations engaged in it will be so exhausted they could do us no harm. At least five of the nations in Europe and one in the Orient will have millions of seasoned and highly trained soldiers, and a navy equal or superior to our own. Any one, and certainly two of them, in our helpless condition could land large forces and exact any terms they desired. Remember that personal valor, enthusiasm and patriotism would count for nothing against such a foe.

While our relations with Germany are attracting the most immediate attention, there are many far-seeing conservative men who do not believe that is the only, if indeed it is the principal source of danger. Such men are keeping their eyes on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic, and there is every

reason why they should. The outlook is far from reassuring. The Mexican and Cuban complications may at any moment, become of far-reaching consequences.

The Monroe Doctrine in the opinion of many thoughtful men is becoming a menace and at any hour may involve us in trouble. There are many ways—here is one of them:

Hundreds of millions of property belonging to the citizens of foreign countries have been destroyed in Mexico, scores of foreign citizens massacred and thousands of them driven from the country in the warfare that has existed there for several years. Under the Monroe doctrine, **we assumed the Mexican problem.** Other countries stepped aside and the losses occured. Under this doctrine no nation is permitted to take the usual steps to compel restitution, such as landing military forces upon Mexican soil, closing its ports or taking possession of the custom houses. In view of this, is there any substantial reason **from the foreign viewpoint** why we should not pay these losses?

Many authorities believe we are morally and probably legally liable for them; but suppose the half dozen nations whose citizens have suffered should present their claims to us and demand payment, what would we do? Suppose one or more countries should decide to ignore the Monroe Doctrine and go into Mexico to collect their claims; suppose one of them should establish a naval base upon Mexican soil—say Magdalena Bay—where it could control the Panama Canal, what would we do about it?

Suppose these or other demands were made upon us to which we could not yield. Let us remember two things in this connection:

1. War does not depend upon the disposition of the pacific, but upon that of the **bellicose.**

2. That unless our country puts itself in a position to **defend its rights, we may soon have no rights to defend.**

George Washington said, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." The truth of the statement is borne out by history and by experience. Had Great Britain been prepared on land, as she was on sea; had she had a trained citizenry of four millions of men, as she was compelled to have after the European war broke out, it is the belief of many that the present war would not have been started. What Great Britain's unpreparedness at the beginning of the war cost her, is now apparent to all.

In view of this experience, is it not criminal for a nation to wait until war has actually been declared before making preparation? General Henry Lee of Washington's army said, "A government is the murderer of its citizens which sends them to the field for battle uninformed and untrained where they are to meet men trained for battle."

Military authorities agree that if Washington's army had been well-trained and properly equipped, the Revolutionary War would have been over in a year, instead of lasting seven years.

A strong, trained and virile manhood must be built up and maintained if our country is to hold its proper position in the sisterhood of nations. By military training the nation will be provided with the most intelligent, country-loving citizen-soldiery anywhere to be found. It costs too much blood and tears, too much waste and suffering to wait until a crisis is upon us and then prepare. The state of being uprepared invites attack. **Strength through preparation means peace.** A boy may kick a cur, but he will not kick a bull dog—there is a reason. With universal military training the probability of war would be diminished to the vanishing point.

Will Military Training Satisfy the Nation?

History records the rise and fall of nations and shows that strength, virility and the ability to defend themselves were essentials of national existence. When nations have become opulent and indolent, when extravagance displaced thrift, and indulgence weakend moral fiber, then relaxation and decadence followed. An armed foe and subjugation completes the story. Security lies in strength; weakness is a source of danger in the life of a nation as it is in the life of an individual.

We have been accustomed to think that our country, isolated by two wide oceans, needed no other defense. Modern science has destroyed that isolation. Submarine ships from other lands have already entered our harbors. The airship is the practical certainty of tomorrow.

In universal military training we have the best assurance of peace that can be effectuated and the only one that would serve us in case of war. In such training our country would take the wisest course and insure the safety and prosperity of the people. War may never be forced upon us, but there is always the danger that it will be. **Fire may never destroy your home, but there is danger of it, hence the wise in-**

sure. In the construction and equipment of buildings we spend large sums to reduce the fire hazard. So military training reduces the likelihood of war. It will give us over 500,000 trained men per year or 2,500,000 men in five years. When the world knows we have this splendid body of loyal citizens that may at once become efficient soldiers, together with our incomparable financial and physical resouces, any nation will hesitate before attacking us.

Voluntary Military Service A Delusion

Experience shows that in a prolonged war voluntary enlistments are never sufficient and that conscription must be resorted to. This was true of our own country in the Civil War when patriotism was at flood-tide and a similar condition prevails in England today. There is always a large and honorable number willing to die to save the nation and quite a large and dishonorable number who are willing to let them do it. A volntary system of military defense puts a penalty on patriotism and a premium on cowardise.

At the threshold of consideration let us keep in mind that the government has, and has always had, absolute power to call for military service every able bodied man in the land between eighteen and forty-five years of age. There is no escape and no excuses will avail.

The law of required service is the foundation of the family, the state and the nation. In these relations duties are not optional; they are obligatory. Children must obey their parents and do as directed or the family will be a failure. No government, dependent upon voluntary action, would have stability. In a Republic, the duty of all is to serve and support the government, each according to his ability. We are required to pay taxes, to do jury service and to send our children to school. For the safety of the community we are compelled to observe health regulations. These and scores of other provisions necessary for the common good must be compulsory.

A Story in Point

A lad of fourteen, returning from the Boy Scout encampment at Plum Island, at dinner observed his younger brother in an ill-tempered mood. The father and mother both attempted to discipline him but without success. After considerable argument a compromise was effected and the quarrel was concluded. When it was over, the boy scout asked to

see his father privately. W hen they were alone, he said, "Dad, I do not wish to be impertinent or butt in, but I tell you that the discipline in this family is rotten. I have learned what discipline means, and I think it should be established in this family." It was.

There has never been, and there never can be good citizenship, good order, and good government without laws that will require every individual to do his share, to carry his part of the burden, and to discharge his obligation whatever it may be.

There is nothing fair about a volunteer system. Universal training coupled with obligation to serve if needed, is only the square deal in democracy and will produce the only sufficient defense. Democracy means the rule of the majority and the service of all. Anything less is not democracy. To permit some citizens to shirk their duty because they want to, and let others defend the country because they are willing is undemocratic. All need and demand protection. All should help to defend.

Military training should not be confused with military service. The larger the number of men trained the greater will be our strength and less will the probability of actual service being required. We cannot evade the obligation to defend the country by failing to train, but by thorough training and being strong and ready we probably would escape war.

In a word, the more trained men we have available for the defense of the flag, the less the probability that we shall be called upon to defend it. Under our conditions today, military training is more a preparation for peace than it is for war.

What Will It Do For Manhood

Every well-informed person knows that military training develops a boy physically as nothing else will. After training he stands erect. head up, and chest out; he knows how to walk; it gives him a manly bearing, a fine lung development, hardens his muscles and makes him alert and responsive. It teaches obedience to authority and respect for the rights of others. It emphasizes courtesy and good breeding. It teaches him how to take care of himself physically and grow into strong manhood.

The physical regeneration of this country and the benefits to the fathers of the future cannot be overestimated. Military training will arrest decadence into which we are drifting and will build up our national life. **Six months' intensive**

military training, such as proposed, is equal to eighteen months in the regular army under peace conditions.

There is another exceedingly important feature: It will bring together young men from all parts of the country and from all walks of life, the rich and the poor, from the homes of affluence and the homes of poverty. It will put these men into the same uniform, into the same tents, and train them for the defense of the country. This close relationsip will make for the common good, and most assuredly integrate us into a nation, break down barriers, remove misconceptions, sweep away erroneous preconceived ideas, establish friendships, give a wider horizon, a truer viewpoint, and cause all to realize that there is here a government to which we owe an obligation and that it must be met.

There is a commercial value to this training. For the purpose of ascertaining this definitely, the writer took the matter up with about one hundred large employers of young men and all virtually agreed that any young man taking this training would be a better employee, more dependable, more alert and would have greater initiative, better judgment and greater physical strength than an untrained lad. They said they would give a young man who had been thus trained the preference over the untrained man, other things being equal. There was no sentiment about it. It was a cold-blooded proposition. Their conclusions compositely stated were that such training was of so much value to the young man that it would pay him to take it even if there were no probability of war.

Universal military training is the one effective melting-pot for the making of real Americans and real men.

Boys Need Discipline

The American boy, probably more than any other, needs discipline. He must be taught to respect authority and made to feel a sense of responsibility. Too many are drifting aimlessly. The poolrooms, the dance halls, and "just loafing" sends tens of thousands to ruin every year.

The venerable Bishop Samuel Fallows, who for twenty-one years was the head of the great Illinois State Reformatory at Pontiac, said before the United States Senate Committee which was considering the question of military training, **that such training would have made it unnecessary to commit at 75 percent of the boys in that institution.** The Bishop is an

authority. He enlisted at the outbreak of the Civil War as a private and earned his way to a position of brigadier-general. He is now the head of the Army of Tennessee, the successor to Gerneral Sherman and General Dodge.

In concluding his statement he said: "Such training will save three bad boys out of four and make them worthy citizens and it will make good boys better. Such training will make a boy manly, more courteous and physically stronger. It will harden his muscles, give him greater lung capacity and the ability to resist disease."

Suppose you make a list of twenty of the young men of your acquaintance. Look over the list. How many of them would be able to step into the ranks at once as efficient defenders of their country? Probably not one could do so. How many of them would be greatly benefited by the discipline that goes with military training, by the uniform courtesy required, the respect for authority, the promptness of action, the manly bearing and the physical and mental vigor that comes from such training? Intensive training keeps the boy busy and federal control of surroundings would give those training a protection not found under usual camp conditions.

Are We Prepared?

Frederic L. Huidekoper in "The Military Unpreparedness of the United States" says, "The fundamental law of life is the law of strife and in the supreme test, 'might' nearly always prevails. The American people have but two alternatives, either to profit by the lessons taught every day by the present European struggle and thus avert the horrors inseparable from war, or to learn these lessons by the bitterest experience which human beings can undergo. Which shall it be?"

"Adequate preparation for war has never yet in history been made after the beginning of hostilities without horrible slaughter, unjustifiable expense, and national peril. It is only in the years of peace that a nation can be made ready to fight."

The world is being remade in the awful cauldron of war. What of the future? No one can tell. The world is full of hate and envy. The brotherhood of man in the federation of the world is still a dream. If we prepare for the worst, it is probable that the worst will not come.

Under prevailing conditions, there should not be a doubt in the minds of anyone that as a nation we are in a perilous posi-

tion. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. We know that our country today is in no position to defend itself against attack from any one of a dozen leading nations. Our navy is barely half-manned and the ranks of our army are crumbling. It is entirely obvious that something must be done to protect ourselves and insure our peace and tranquillity.

Every well-informed person knows that our country today is in no position to make an effective defense against even a second or third rate power. The Mexican border patrol and the chase of Villa required practically all of our military resources. There are many things to be done before our country will be safe. **The doing of one of these is the purpose of this organization, namely: To bring about a sane and sensible plan of military training and have it maintained as a fixed policy of our government.**

Good Advice From Great Educators

Dr. Henry Pratt Judson, President of the University of Chicago, an eminent scholar, a close observer, and one who has spent months in the Orient, in a notable address before the City Club of Chicago, January 19, 1917, among other things said:

"Formerly I believed that this was a day of progress and civilization in the world, that it was a time when international disputes could be settled in accordance with principles of justice and right; when smaller nations might pursue their honest destinies with respectful treatment from mighty powers, but my ideas have undergone a change.

"It is apparent that there are great powers which classify as national pirates. They are nations which deliberately intend to take possession of other nations in accordance with their deliberate piratical policies whenever their might enables them. In the face of such policies, it is apparent that the United States is in danger of attack. The United States is a rich and helpless people and a piratical attack could be made with ease against us in our unpreparedness.

"These attacks by these piratical nations not only can happen but will happen unless the United States wakes up to a realization of her helplessness and the propensity of foreign nations which brush aside right and justice in the pursuit of their piratical policies.

"There is absolute need of military preparedness and universal military training being taken up without delay."

Dr. Charles W. Eliot, President Emeritus, Harvard University, noted educator, and a profound thinker, in "The World's Work" for November, 1917, says:

"Steam and electricity have done away with the physical isolation of the United States. The oceans are not barriers, but highways which invite the passage of fleets, pacific or hostile. The security of America can no longer be trusted to the width of the Atlantic and Pacific." He says further:

"The only available insurance is a navy, powerful in every respect, and an army of reserve visibly strong in numbers and visibly prepared for immediate service."

THE EFFECTS OF MILITARY DRILL ON BOYS

DUDLEY A. SARGENT, M. D.
Director of the Hemenway Gymnasium, Harvard University.
Cambridge, Mass.

To select at once a system of exercise that will do no harm to any one, and yet be beneficial to all, is a difficult task, yet we shall come nearer doing the greatest good to the greatest number if we follow what may be termed the physiological method. As near as I have been able to ascertain them, the essential requisites of a good exercise may be summed up in the following suggestions:

1. The person should be sufficiently interested in the exercise to give it his attention in order to secure the necessary volitional power to start the movement. Any exercise executed in a lifeless way is of little benefit to nerve or muscles in a healthy condition.

2. There should be a weight or resistance to overcome in order to bring out the working force of the muscle, the theory being that the muscles were not created merely to move the parts to which they are attached, but to do service and help man bear his burdens.

3. The exercise must be performed with sufficient vigor and rapidity to engage the energetic contraction of the muscles employed. When this is done, old tissue is brokn down, and its place is supplied with new material in increased quantity, thus augmenting the size and strength of the muscles. The rapidity of the movement puts a limit to the weight used, and the alternate contraction and relaxation of the muscles assist the circulation of the blood in the parts employed.

4. As many muscles as possible must be brought into action in order to secure a well-orbed and harmonious development of the whole body . . . . . .

5. A sufficient number of muscles should be called into action at one time to stimulate the action of the heart and lungs, and increase the circulation and respiration. This is one of the most important considerations to bear in mind in regard to exercise.....

The chief advantage of exercises that give employment to many muscles at one time is that by increasing the respiration and quickening the circulation, they improve the health and strength of all parts of the body.

6. As a "latent period" precedes the contraction of the muscle, so a momentary period of rest should, as far as possible, precede movement in exercise. This is best secured where there is an alternation in the movements, as in walking, running, rowing, etc. All tetanized movements, such as holding weights, standing in a constricted position, etc., tend to inspair the tone of the muscles by interefring with the nutrition of both muscles and nerves.

7. The exercises of the young should be of such a composite nature as to bring about the co-operation and co-ordination of the muscles. This involves principally the training of the central nerve system. All gymnastic sports and athletic games that require skill, dexterity, coolness, courage, and presence of mind, are included in this list, and are exceedingly valuable to any system of physical training, as adjuncts in the development of character.

My prinicpal objection to military drill as a physical exercise is that it does not to any extent meet the physiological demands of the body as set forth in the seven observations just referred to. In other words: It is not of sufficient interest as a means of physical development to arouse any moral earnestness and enthusiasm on the part of the boys. The exercise of the manual is not performed with sufficient force and rapidity to engage the energetic contraction of the muscles employed. It is essentially a one-sided exercise, bringing into excessive action the elevators of the right scapula, the deltoid, biceps, flexors of the fore-arm, wrist and fingers of the right side, while the other muscles, excepting the legs on parade days, do not get sufficient employment to keep them in good condition. It does not increase the respiration and quicken the circulation to a sufficient extent to secure the constitutional benefits that should accure from exercise.

During the drill the clothing is buttoned close around the chest, and natural respiration is hindered. The muscles are not alternately contracted and relaxed, but are tetanized or kept in a state of prolonged tension. This, as we have seen, not only impairs the tone of the muscles used, but it also puts an additional strain upon the brain and nervous system at a time when both

should be as much relieved as possible. Finally, the mere exercise of the manual of arms does not give sufficient breadth and scope of movement to secure the co-operation of the muscles, and as a training for the central nerve system, it is of little or no value.

Coolness, courage, presence, of mind, and that rapid and responsible exercise of judgment in emergencies, so valuable to the man of business, as well as to the soldier, are not developed by the drill itself, though I will admit that other normal attributes, such as obedience, practice, fortitude, and forbearance, may be brought into a high degree of perfection. The community at large have long entertained the idea that there was something about military drill that made young men erect, or, as the committee have been pleased to term it, giving them a graceful and manly bearing.

I dislike to take from the drill one of the strongest attributes that has commended it to parents and teachers, but unless I have been misled in my observations, there is nothing in the drill itself that tends to make one erect or graceful. On the other hand, I am prepared to maintain that it tends to make him stiff and angular in his moments, as well as to droop and round his shoulders.

This was long since brought to the attention of military authorities, and a set of calisthenic exercises or free gymnastics has been incorporated into all of the treatises on military tactics, to correct the tendency. I refer to what is familiarly known as the "setting-up" drill. . . . . .

In reference to the gracefulness that is thought to characterize the movements of young cadets, I can only say it is not the outcome of drilling and marching. The soldier is trained to square corners, straight platoons, and angular movements. Curves and embellishments are not encouraged in speech or in action. If you would account for the graceful poise of our National cadets, you must visit West Point in summer, and see them for one or two hours a day in charge of the dancing master.

Those who have had the pleasure of examining school boys, or of looking over their measurements or photoplays, will bear me out in saying that the strong and well developed boys are largely in the minority.

The pupils attending our public and private schools represent nearly every phase and condition in life. Some are well nurtured, others are not. Some have favorably hygienic surroundings at home, others are subjected to unhealthy influences. All bear the stamp of a good or bad inheritance, and the strong and weak points show themselves in the physique as readily as they do in mental characteristics. . . . . .

My attention was long since called to what I think may be termed the prevailing weakness or defects in the school boys' and student's physique.

There are a drooping of the head, flatness of the chest, narrowness of the waist, and an exaggeration of the normal or physiological curves of the spine, and I might add to this number, though it is not quite so common in boys as in girls, lateral curvature of the spine. These defects, I say, are so apparent, that it does not take a practised eye to detect them . They attract the attention at once or any one who cares to examine the figures. . .

Personally, I do not put particular stress upon these malformations, if they can be discovered in time. Nearly all of them can be corrected by judicious exercise. If allowed to increase, however, they invariably lead to spinal disease, or to some functional disturbance of the heart, stomach, or lungs, followed sooner or later by structural changes in these important organs.

Whatever the original cause of these physical defects may be, the immediate cause is a weakness of the supporting muscles.

After the body has once acquired a bias in the wrong direction many exercises otherwise beneficial are likely to be injurious. Among this number are horseback riding, rowing, lawn tennis, and military drill. . . . . .

After taking the most favorable view of military drill as a physical exercise, we are led to conclude that its constrained positions, and closely localized movements do not afford the essential requisites for developing the muscles, and improving the respiration and circulation, and thereby improving the general health and condition of the system. We must further conclude that in case of any malformation, local weakness or constitutional debility, the drill tends, by its strain upon the nerves and prolonged tension on the muscles, to increase the defects rather than to relieve them.

Finally, if the ultimate object of the drill was to prepare young men for the life and duties of a soldier, we should be forced to conclude that the drill itself would still be defective as a means of developing the chief requisites for men in that profession.

This defect, we are pleased to state, is recognized by the great military nations of Europe, and measures are taken to give all recruits from three to twelve months' gymnastic training to develop them as men, before they are expected to conform to the requirements of the soldier.—Extract from article in Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.

FIRST SIX PRESIDENTS URGED COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

Extracts from Messages of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson

Washington

In his first annual address to congress,Pres ident Washington, after a few introductory sentences, drove straight to the subject of national defense.

"Among the many interesting objects which will engage your attention," said the president, "that of providing for the common defense will merit particular regard. To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

"A free people ought not only to be armed, but disciplined; to which end a uniform and well-digested plan is requisite; and their safety and interest require that they should promote such manufactories as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly military, supplies."

Washington's Plan for Universal Military Training

Thirteen days later Washington addressed a brief message to congress, accompanied by plans for universal military training. "Conceiving the subject to be of the highest importance to the welfare of our country," said Washington, "I have directed him (the secretary of war) to lay the plan before congress."

With characteristic modesty Washington gave credit for these plans to his secretary of war, General Henry Knox, but Major Henry C. Davis of the United States Marine corps, after a study of "American State Papers," finds that Washington directed its preparation and materially amended it himself before giving it to congress. It had his enthusiastic approval, and he declared that "It is a capital security to a free state for the great body of the people to possess competent knowledge of military art."

Here is the general scope of the plan as condensed from Vol. 1, "American State Papers:"

All citizens between 18 and 60, with specific exceptions, to be enrolled for different degrees of military duty and divided into three distrinct classes: the youth of 18, 19 and 20 years of age, the advanced corps; the men from 21 to 45 years of age, the main corps; the men from 46 to 60 years of age, the reserve corps.

Right to Vote Acquired by Military Training

"The advanced corps are designed not only as a school in which the youth of the United States are to be instructed in the art of war, but they are, in all cases of exigence, to serve as an actual defense of the community. The whole of the armed corps shall be clothed, armed and subsisted at the expense of the United States, and encamped together if practicable, or by legions, which encampments shall be denominated the annual camps of discipline. The youth of 18 and 19 years shall be disciplined for 30 days successively in each year; and those of 20 years shall be disciplined only for 10 days in each year, which shall be the last 10 days of the annual encampment."

Under this plan Washington's military training and service were to be the price paid by the citizen for the right to vote and hold public office. Having rendered the required service the young man was to be given a certificate of full and honorable citizenship, and without that certificate he could not vote or hold any position of public preferment.

Congress failed to enact the Washington bill, but passed instead the militia law of 1792, which affirmed the principles of universal liability to military service, but neglected to put that principle into effect. It declared that every-able male citizen between the ages of 18 and 45 was a member of the militia. Those voluntarily enrolling and training were termed the organized militia and the great body of untrained citizenship the unorganized militia.

Adams

John Adams, second president, followed Washington's example and urged that congress strengthen the country's defenses. In a special message, session of May 16, 1797, Adams said: "As our country is vulnerable in other interests besides those of its commerce you will seriously deliberate whether the means of general defense ought not to be increased by an addition to the regular artillery and cavalry and by arrangements for forming a provisional army. With the same view, and as a measure which even in a time of universal peace ought not to be neglected, I recommend to your consideration a revision of the laws for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia, to render that natural and safe defense of the country efficacious."

President Adams here was referring to the whole militia of the Union—all able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and

45. He wanted them to be organized, drilled and disciplined, and to that end called on congress to pass additional legislation.

Jefferson

President Jefferson felt earnestly the need of compulsory training and military service. With his own hand he drafted a bill in 1805 "for classing the militia and assigning to each class its particular duties." (Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Federal edition, volume 10, page 213.)

Jefferson's bill provided that "every free, able-bodied white male citizen of the United States of the age of 18 years and under the age of 45, whose principal occupation is not on the high seas or the tidewaters within the United States, shall be of the militia for the land service of the United States."

Jefferson wanted to classify the militia into four classes; those above 18 and under 21, the minor class; those above 21 and under 26, the junior class; those above 26 and under 35, the middle class, and those above 35 and under 45, the senior class.

But Jefferson's advice was rejected, as Washington's counsel had been neglected. There were pacificists in those days, and they raised constitutional objections. The Union was still looked upon by many as a loose confederation of sovereign states, and local prejudices were turned against Jefferson's plan as a thing too ultra federal.

Jefferson retired to private life and the country went rashly unprepared to war with Great Britain in 1812. It was a humiliating war for the United States. Our poorly trained militia ran off one field after another and abandoned the national capital to an inferior force of British soldiers. We glimpse conditions from a letter written by Jefferson, September 9, 1814, to John Wayles Eppes:

"If our government ever fails it will be from this weakness. No government can be maintained without the principle of fear as well as of duty. Good men will obey the last, but bad ones the former only. Our country is a desert. None are to be met in the roads but grayheads. About 800 men are gone from it, and chiefly volunteers. But I fear they cannot be armed.

"I think the truth must now be obvious, that our people are too happy at home to enter into regular service, and that we cannot be defended but by making every citizen a soldier, as the Greeks and Romans, who had no standing armies,

and that in doing this all must be marshaled, classed by their ages and every service ascribed to its competent class."

Madison

A belief has long been extant, fostered by false representations in school histories and the flamboyant oratory of Fourth of July speakers, that the militia forces of the United States drove the British armies before them as the November blasts scatter the frosted leaves of autumn. The painful truth is that our poorly drilled and imperfectly disciplined militia did a lot of running from numerically inferior forces of the enemy and were whipped in nearly every engagement of that war.

Only the good fortune that England was at war with France and that Madison's administration, thoroughly humiliated by our military reserves, was taking steps to organize and train much larger forces, induced England to accept the war as a draw and negotiate the peace treaty of Ghent.

This war was fought in the administration of Madison, and Madison's last annual message to congress discloses his honest judgment about the inefficiency of the militia.

"As a subject of the highest importance to the national welfare," said Madison's message of December 3, 1816, "I must again earnestly recommend to the consideration of congress a reorganization of the militia on a plan which will form it into classes according to the periods of life more or less adapted to military service. An efficient militia is authorized and contemplated by the Constitution and required by the spirit and safety of free government.

"The present organization of our militia is universally regarded as less efficient than it ought to be made, and no organization can be better calculated to give to it a due force than to give to it a due classification which will assign the foremost place in the defense of the country to that portion of its citizens whose activity and animation best enable them to rally to its standard. Besides the consideration that a time of peace is the time when the change can be made with the most convenience and equity, it will now be aided by the experience of a recent war in which the militia bore so interesting a part."

Note Madison's studied use of the word "interesting." With the sorry record of the war immediately behind him, he could not, in honesty of speech, say the militia had borne a "gallant," an "honorable" or even a "distinguished" part.

But congress was again supine and nothing was done to heed the wise counsels of Madison and his predecessors. The old defective militia law of 1792 was allowed to stand, and it stands substantially today.

Monroe

President Monroe added his plea to the plans of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and Madison. "As the defense and even the liberties of the country,' he said in a message to congress, "depend in times of imminent danger on the militia. it is of the highest importance that it be well organized, armed and disciplined throughout the Union."

Here again Monroe was speaking of the whole militia of the nation—the unorganized citizenry between the ages of 18 and 45.

Jackson

President Jackson, reiterated the counsel of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. He urged that the whole body of the militia be organized and classified for training and liability to service:

"A classification of the population," said President Jackson in his message of December 7, 1835, "offers the obvious means of effecting this organization. Such a division may be made as will be just to all by transferring each at a proper period of life from one class to another and by calling first for the service of that class, whether for instruction or action, which from age is qualified for the duty and may be called to perform it with the least injury to themselves or the public.

"Should the danger ever become so imminent as to require additional force the other classes in succession would be ready for the call. And if in addition to this organization voluntary associations were encouraged and inducements held out for their formation our militia would be in a state of efficient service.

"Now, when we are at peace, is the proper time to digest and establish a practicable system. The object is certainly worth the experiment and worth the experience. No one appreciating the blessing of a republician government can object to his share of the burden which such plan may impose. Indeed, a moderate proportion of the national funds could scarcely be better applied than in carrying into effect and continuing such an arrangement, and in giving the necessary elementary instruction.'

VARIOUS OPINIONS

David Starr Jordan, From "War and the Breed"

The objections to Military Training as part of a general education are mainly three. The one is that such training is on the whole highly specalized for a particular profession. and that, war. The second is that the martial spirit or specific bias which this training gives to some degree unfits its possessor to consider justly the affairs in which this nation is concerned. It tends to exaggerate that perverted form of patriotism expressed in words "my country, right or wrong". . . . . A third objection is that military drill is in the hands of non-commissioned officers, in general with no fitness for teaching, while its value as exercise is far inferior to that of a well-appointed gymnasium, or even of an ordinary athletic field.

Col. Thomas F. Edmands: "In Boston the effect of school drill has been to make boys round shouldered and narrow chested. I. never saw a school company well set up in my life. Except a few of the larger ones the boys are overweighted by the musket they are obliged to carry."

"The modern drill regulations are by no means adapted for work in the schools under any circumstances. They need a man's brains and muscle. Every time I tell the truth about the matter, I generally raise a storm from persons illy informed upon the subject, and from the boys, whose self-conceit engendered by this drill, should be one of the greatest arguments against its further practice."

Frederic L. Huidekoper: "General Henry Lee (Light Horse Harry), a distinguished officer during the Revolution. epitomized the matter admirably when he asserted that 'A Government is the murderer of its citizens which sends them to the field uninformed and untaught where they are to meet men of the same age and strength, mechanized by education and discipline for battle."

Military Training in Our Public Schools

Military training has not enough educationl value to replace any subject that rightfully belongs in the school courses of study. This objection is approved by Prof. John Dewey, Pres. Henry Churchill King of Oberlin College, Ex-Pres. Charles W. Elliot of Harvard University, Ex-Governor Charles E. Hughes and Ex-Secretary of State Gen. John W. Foster.

The supposed benefits of military training can be secured more effectively by other means, viz.: The gymnasium, out-

door games and athletics. This statement is supported by such expert testimony as that of Dr. Dudley Sargent, head of the Hemenway Gymnasium, Harvard University, Prof. Reichart of the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Nathan C. Schaeffer, State Superintendent of Schools, Pennsylvania, Prof. Charles Zueblin, and Dr. David Starr Jordan. Moreover, the supposed benefits of military drill are due not to the system but to the personality of the particular instructor.

It is not a burden on the individual but a duty owing to the State

Luke E. Wright: "The fact is that the volunteer is not a reliable soldier, and any people that leans upon him leans upon a broken reed.

"The volunteer system is a failure. It is wrong in principle and it is bad in practice. No people have ever been able to fight a long continued war, to endure a strain upon all their resources, under the volunteer system. The fact is that the Confederacy in our Civil War thought they could lick the Yankees in just a year; they gave themselves ample margin; and so they enlisted their own men for twelve months. The twelve months expired and they were mistaken, woefully so; and thereupon by a conscripting act all of those twelve month men were simply blanketed into the army for the rest of the war.

Advantages Are Numerous

C. E. Calkins, in "Cyclopoedia of American Government," Vol. 2, Page 439

"The military advantages of an automatic system which makes every class of the population bear a part in national defense are incontestable. Not only does it provide for an ample standing army during peace and perpetuate the military tradition, but it provides a practically unlimited reserve of trained soldiers in the prime of life. Thus all the extravagance and disorder of hurried recruiting, the bounties for volunteering and the irritating enforcement of conscription, are avoided. The army is mobilized for war by filling the ranks of the existing organization, without sending improvised regiments or companies to the front; and no command is trusted to an untrained officer."

With Civic Duty Goes Military Duty and Upon Both Our Existence Depends

From an address by John Purroy Mitchel, former Mayor of New York City

"We are passing today through a great crisis in our national life. The issue is more than national; it is as broad as the human race itself. Into our hands here has been committed the heritage of democratic government. It is our trust to perpetuate it, to develop it, to transmit it to posterity, a serviceable agent for the advancement of civilization and for the happiness of mankind. Here in this nation and country of ours the efficiency of democracy is on trial today. Here under our free institutions through one hundred and thirty years of effort and progress, we have developed governmental and civic efficiency. We teach our citizens the sense of individual civic responsibility, and they respond to it. During the greater part of the time, due to geographical location and the absence of hostile motives abroad, we have enjoyed peace. Now that science has obliterated distance and our prosperity and commerce supply the motive, we can no longer count upon an effective peace. Democracy, therefore, must meet the new conditions. But through its elementary sufficiency for self-preservation we must teach our citizens that with civic duty goes military duty, and that both are obligations on which the life of the state depends."

Labor's Attitude

Samuel Gompers declares in favor of training for defense of the nation

"We must have a preparation that means a comprehensive development of all the powers and resources of all our citizens. In Switzerland every man is a soldier—not necessarily to go to war—but he has the physical and manual training necessary to defend himself, his family, and his country. Under that system the Swiss have developed a manhood, a character, that challenges the admiration of the world. We will be satisfied with nothing less in America.

"We must see to it that the great mass of the farmers and the workers in industry shall be thoroughly trained and organized. We must see to it that the military and naval forces of the country are controlled in the interests of peace, of justice, of democracy, and of humanity.

"There must be industrial, commercial, political, social,

moral, as well as military defense. Citizen soldiery must be established, and extended. It must be democratically organized, officered, and controlled. We must put an end to the present wasteful and unfair administration of our military affairs."

Dr. Nathan C. Schaeffer: And since military training, as the authorities quoted state, has not enough educational value to replace any other subject, and since the supposed benefits may be effectively secured by other accessible practical systems, and since one-half of the school population is wholly ignored by this system, it therefore seems to be perfectly clear that the educational value of military training is practically nil, and should have no place in our school courses.

Years ago, English schools tried military training and finding it physically harmful gave it up; French schools did the same.

To adopt military training in our schools would be contrary to our national traditions and national ideals; therefore, it would be undemocratic and unAmerican. It would out-Prussianize Prussia, for neither the Prussians nor Germans have as yet been so steeped in militarism as to burden their regular schools with the incubus of military training—Prof. John Dewey, Dr. Nathan Schaeffer and Pres. John H. Findley of New York State University.

Military training in the public schools fosters a spirit of suspicion and distrust of other nations. Acting on the fictitious plea of "National Necessity," a "National Enemy" must be found. This engenders international hatred—a long step toward war.

Charles E. Hughes: Military training in the public schools is not necessary in order to teach patriotism or to provide for national defense. Military training may lead to efficiency on the parade ground or to skill at target practice, but it does not develop, necessarily, the spirit of patriotism. Real patriotism is of the spirit—a quality of mind and heart,—hence it is not acquired by evolutions on the drill ground or by shooting at a target. True patriotism grows out of character. It requires a patriot to live a clean, strong life for his country. We can no longer look to war for the development of either national or individual character.

Prof. G. M. Stratton: From "The Double Standard in Regard to Fighting." The moral danger. The laws of the community and of the State forbid the boy to carry arms.

He knows that the man who assaults his fellowman with a deadly weapon is tried in court for his liberty and his life. He goes to Sunday School and learns the command, "Thou shalt not kill." He attends church and hears that he "must do unto others as he would have others do unto him," and he joins the cadet corps and is trained with gun and sword in the art of killing his fellow-men! Then we wonder why our boys have such hazy ideas on moral questions! We wonder why our boys are so often lacking in clear vision, clear reasoning, and right acting! God pity and help us to see the wrong we are inflicting on the youths of the land by advocating military training for mere boys!

Maj. Gen. Leonard A. Wood, commanding the department of the east, testified before the senate committee:

"If the policy of Knox and General Washington had been approved the chances are we would have had no war of 1812; and if we had had it, we would have held Canada after a short campaign. If we had had that policy the civil war would have been impossible. The uprising would have been crushed in the bud.

"I think you have to drive home that principle of general military obligation and general military training. I think that is the basis of the whole thing. Once you get that basis you can bring your regular army down to a pretty small limit. We should establish a condition under which the greatest possible number of men are trained, and once trained, return to their normal occupations, and only enough men maintained with the colors for the every-day needs of the nation, no more.

"Whether they like it or not, men realize that the principle is sound. A man cannot exercise the suffrage as a right and assume that he has the privilege of deciding whether or not he is to render service in case of necessity****.

"The volunteer system as a system has been a dismal failure in every war we have engaged in and always will be. The good men will go first, then volunteering will stop, as it did in the revolution and 1812, and in the civil war when we went to the draft. We never filled our call for the Spanish war even. It is a rotten system. The spirit is fine, but the system is unsound and spells disaster if we ever go into a real war with it*****. There has been no equality of service. The rich when drafted have been able to buy the poor to take their places. The result has been a debauchery of public morals on the subject of each and every man's obligation to service in time of war. We have never in our entire service waged single-handed a war with a first-class country, and we

have not the slightest conception of what war would mean with an organized and prepared nation, and it is principally with possible war with such a nation that we are concerned."

From a Letter

"Every thoughful man must feel that as the world is constituted no nation is safe nor does its flag command respect unless it is in a position to defend itself and the rights and interests of its people. Lack of preparedness invites attack and insures disaster, while adequate means of defense on land and sea is the best possible insurance for peace that can be written.

"In a democracy security rests upon an appreciation by the people of the basic principle that equality of opportunity goes hand in hand with equality of obligation within the limits of our physical and mental capacity; that we must share and share alike the benefits and privileges as well as the grave responsibilities and duties of citizenship.

"As matters now stand I feel that the most important question before our country today is adequate preparedness and that this must be based upon universal military training; a training which will provide a reasonably effective citizen-soldiery. This training must apply to all young men who are physically fit. Such training if carried on under a system similar to that in effect in Australia or Switzerland will not interfere with the instruction of our youth, but will supplement it.

"The training proposed by the plan submitted by you is in accordance with the best thought of the day on this subject and will, so far as the individual is concerned, turn out a better man physically, intellectually, and morally; it will make him a better man from the economic standpoint because of habits of promptness, thoroughness and exactness. He will be a better all round citizen. It will give him that self-control, respect for the flag, for the authorities and for the rights of others which are so much needed. It will serve to impress upon him a sense of his responsiblity towards the nation and teach him to think in terms of the nation rather than in terms of the individual or locality. It will tend to national solidarity. It will make America what she must be, a real melting pot, fusing the various unassimilated elements into one mass of real Americans.

Col. E. F. Glenn, U. S. General Staff
Australian Mothers Like the Result

"I inquired personally very carefully into the conditions that confronted Australia and also as to how they worked it out. I found that there was great opposition on the part of the mothers of the country to the introduction of this as a compulsory measure. You understand that in Australia it commenced about 1903, and their compulsory law was passed in 1909, to become effective in 1911. After this had been in operation as a compulsory measure for two years, and is so today, from every source that I can get information from, you could not drive it out of Australia on account of the objection of the mothers. They all actually insist upon it, and they insist upon it not from the military point of view—far from it; they insist upon it because of the civil benefits."

War Costs too Much

War is the most terrible calamity that can overtake a nation. Not only does it rob a country of the flower of its manhood and cause untold human suffering and misery, but in a monetary sense, it is the most destructive agency known to mankind.

Again quoting Mr. Huidekoper as authority, we find that: The cost of the Civil War to the North, plus pensions paid to date, is almost ten billions of dollars.

This stupendous amount does not include private losses or destruction of property, the interest paid on the war debt or the losses incurred by the southern confederacy. If these were included, it probably would be double the amount, and the end is not yet.

In the three Indian wars, the Seminole, Blackhawks, and Florida campaigns to suppress about four thousand redskins, the cost was over $83,000,000 or more than $20,000 for every single Indian!

The awful debt so rapidly piling up because of the European war will hang as mill stones around the necks of millions yet unborn in these unhappy countries. The expense to Great Brittain alone is more than $28,000,000 a day. In view of this should we not do all that is possible to insure our country against war and do it by the only way known to man or approved by experience, namely, to develop strength, readiness and ability quickly to meet and vanquish any foe that might attack us? If strong and ready, no nation will trouble us. Let our motto be, "Defense not Defiance."

BRIEF PARAGRAPHS

We should never wait again till the emergency is upon us before we begin to prepare. No one would think of advocating such a policy in any other affair of life; why do it in national affairs?

The real preparation for modern war is not in drilling soldiers. It is in providing armament; equipment, supplies which are necessary to make an army effective. It is admitted that we cannot do the latter; then why do the former?

The Great War demonstrated that we could drill an army in six months that was equal to the best that Germany had. We should keep a standing army large enuf to hold any enemy at bay till we can train a new army. This provides for our defense; we do not need an army for offense.

The safety of every nation depends on its defenders, its soldiers. The negative cannot promise us any miracles to offset or compensate for lack of common prudence and common sense. To send men into modern battle untrained is to slaughter them by thousands and then not secure protection.

It is enuf to ask our young men to rally to their country's defense when there is need of it. Why should one part of the people put an intolerable burden on another part when there is no need for it? When we wish a thing done in a democracy we convince the majority that it should be done. Arguments are the only weapon in a free country.

Every young man is at sea for a year or two after he graduates. Many are uncertain as to what their life work will be, and many who have decided cannot find a desirable opening. A year or two of military training would be a God send to such young men. They would not only lose nothing but the time they are now losing would be profitably used.

The fact is beyond controversy that young men do not want universal military training. It is compulsory in Australia and the year before the war there were 22,143 prosecutions of young men for refusal to drill; the population of Australia is less than that of Ohio. The overwhelming majority of those who favor universal military training are those who know they won't have to take it.

The affirmative claim that because our boys rallied under the selective draft to the nation's defense when they saw there was need of it, that therefore they would rally also in time of peace when there is no need. There is all the difference in the world between the two conditions. The very fact that

they wish to make it universal or compulsory shows that they know that the young men do not want it.

In the last war, the only criticism of our soldiers was that they were too brave; that they exposed themselves too much. They were cool, resourceful and skillful in battle; equal to the finest soldiers in the world. A few months drill had given them all that universal military training could have given them. Two years of military training, as the militarists demand would have been enormous waste.

We already have nearly 4,000,000 young men who have already had excellent military training. They can be mobilized in a few weeks at any time they may be needed. Half of these young men will be under thirty ten years from now. Why, then, should we be in such a hurry to get universal military training started? It is as clear as anything under the sun that we will not need it for a number of years.

Since we have had so many men in military training recently, for some years, perhaps, not much will be required. It is a most excellent and favorable time to begin such a policy. All we shall need is to keep up what has been gained by those of military age, and train the relatively small number of those becoming of such age. There never can be a time when universal military training could be so easily introduced as now.

The chief preparation for war in these days is not military evolutions which constitute the chief part of military training. It is handling war machinery; the machine guns, the cannon, the aeroplanes. These require long and thoro training of a few men. There is no need whatever of more than an army of officers and specialists. Americans are quick to learn; all we need is somebody to teach them when there is need.

Even if the general position of the affirmative were valid their demand is excessive. Universal military training would prepare an army of ten millions of men. The widest and most extravagant militarist in the nation could find no use for such an army as that. It would be like taking a fourteen inch cannon to shoot a chicken hawk, or club to brush off a fly. The affirmative demand is ridiculously, monstrously, excessive.

America is the only nation which can take the lead in discouraging military preparations. She is so protected by her geographical situation that no nation on earth would be crazy enuf to even think of attacking her within the next five or ten

years, and all the nations of the world know this. If we go to making preparations our influence for peace is at an end. We cannot be trusted as a peaceable nation while we go on preparing for war.

The militarists pretend that they want military training for physical development of our young men, and that they do not expect them to ever have to fight. Well, if physical training is all they are after, why don't they go in for physical training? It would not cost a fraction of what military training would cost; it would be open to no objections; it would provide for the young women also. The truth is that physical development is only a pretext. It is mere camouflage.

It is argued that universal military training would endanger the freedom of labor. The whole experience of history is against this opinion; and the reasons are evident. If there is universal military training laboring men get more of it than their opponents because there are so many more of them. Then when laboring men unite they do not form a mob but an army and can get their rights; and at the same time their military training would be the best possible insurance against mobs.

The negative bring up purely theoretical testimony to show that military training is not good physical exercise; that it does not build up health and physical efficiency. Why do they do that when we have right before our eyes the proof from thousands and tens of thousands of actual cases where military training produced great improvement, and the improvement was common to all classes of soldiers. The effects of the physical training were magnificent, wonderful, and to the last degree, undeniable.

It takes nearly or quite as long to mobilize the equipment, food supplies, transportation, etc. of a modern army as it does to train an army. In fact, during the last war we got the army ready long before we got cannon, machine guns, and aeroplanes. An army would be useless without enormous military stores and supplies. But they would not keep; they have to be provided only when war is in sight. We might spend millions in guns and equipments which would be sent to the scrap heap by new inventions.

In the last war, our soldiers at least had to fight without adequate supplies of cannon, machine guns, and aeroplanes. There was where we lackt preparation. To send an army into a modern battle without ample equipment is wholesale murder.

The negative favor this sort of preparation because it is real effective preparation. Universal military training without corresponding preparation in armament and equipment would be utterly futile. If the latter is amply provided the former is not needed voluntary enlistments are ample.

We have inherited our American institutions from our fathers. They are not ours to squander or jeopardise, but to transmit to those who are to come after us. Our obligations to self protection are not for our own sakes only or even chiefly, but to protect these priceless institutions which are not ours, but which we hold in trust for posterity and for humanity. To deliberately refuse to do anything and everything that can be done to preserve this heritage is more than a blunder; it is the supremest crime ,a breach of trust, a betrayal of posterity.

Most of the governments of the world still believe in war. Many others object to it but do not believe that there is any substitute for it; that war is inevitable. Whether we like it or not, we live in that kind of a world. The affirmative does not believe in military training because we believe in war; we are as much opposed to war as the negative is. We believe in military training because there is no other ultimate protection that we can absolutely depend on. The negative can offer us nothing, they cannot even suggest anything. They merely ask us to take chances.

Japan and China are good illustrations of both sides of this question. Japan has less than one-eighth of the population of China, and not a fraction of her resources, and yet Japan ranks with the greatest nations in the world and China is a football kickt with impunity by any nation that wishes to indulge in that pastime. Absolutely helpless, China is appealing to outside nations now to protect her from little Japan. It is all right for China to want peace; we honor her for that; but she must take the right way to get it. A nation must be able to protect herself or she can have no standing among nations.

The Republic of ancient Rome had a large army. Tho maintaind ostensibly for protection against foren foes it inevitably got mixt up in domestic controversies, so that the day came when rival candidates had an army back of them and political strife became civil war. It is a lesson for the American republic. We may safely have a large army when we have something definite for it to do; but to have an idle

army on the supposition that Satan will not find anything for idle hands to do has, in all our history, been deemd a dangerous policy; a policy which there is no immediate reason for abandoning.

What we think of war does not matter; that does not enter into the question at all. The only question is what will infallibly protect our nation and its institutions. We choose weapons not according to our personal tastes but to meet the dangers arrayed against us. What would we think of a man who would choose a penknife or walking stick for protection against a pack of wolves because those utensils were personally more agreeable to him. Sanity would require that we choose military training as a protection because that is what every other nation on earth is doing. It is the only thing that can give us any real protection.

Even if we were willing to take our chances on a policy of non-preparation for our own individual interests, what right have we to use such a policy in taking care of a trust. We may run risks with what is our own but we have no right to take chances in caring for that which is entrusted to us. We may experiment with our own matters but we have no shadow of right to experiment with the vital interests and welfare of others. Universal military training will render us safe; as safe as anything can be in this world. No other plan offers us any security whatever; the negative can only tell us that they hope nobody will attack us.

The affirmative make much of the claim that they wish us to prepare for defense only, not for attack. That's exactly what the Germans have been saying for a generation past. But they say, "we are not Germany." The question is not what we think of ourselves and our intentions but what the rest of the world think of them. We may think ourselves paragons of righteousness and justice but that has no weight in this discussion. The rest of the world think that we are human beings; they do not think that we wear wings under our cloaks; they are more likely to think that we wear daggers if we go to making such enormous military preparations.

It is not a question of what ought to be or would be in an ideal world; it is a question of what IS. A nation with no power to enforce her will has little or no influence among the nations of the world. We may remonstrate with nations for being so naughty; we may entreat them to be good, but by doing so we only succeed in making ourselves ridiculous

Can't the negative see that the world has not yet reacht the condition where such methods are practicable; that all effective power among nations rests on force? It is folly to argue about an ideal world when we don't have it. We must govern ourselves by the facts of the world of this day as we find them.

The affirmative advise that we make extravagant preparation for war and then advocate peace. But who would believe us? If we believe in peace we must act accordingly; we must trust peaceful methods and policies. We can run some risks of war for the sake of universal peace. If one member of the League of Nations shows clearly that it has no confidence in it what effect would it have on the other members? What good would it do to hold out our left hand to a neighbor as a token of peaceful intentions when she knows perfectly well that we hold a dagger in the right hand. Extravagant military preparation makes a farce of all our efforts for universal peace.

A large army would be certain to embroil us in foren troubles and controversies. A large idle army would want something to do. They would not enjoy loafing around a camp all their lives. Every time there was a chance to mix up in a foren affair they would be eager to go. And they would marshall all the influence they could command in favor of such policies, and so would be a constant menace to the peacableness of our foren relations. But we must have protection in some way. The only alternative to a large standing army is universal military training so that soldiers would all be engaged in civil pursuits till there was actual need of their services in the army.

If we go to making extensive military preparations it is as certain as anything can be that it will cause other nations to make more preparations than they otherwise would. If then, we double our preparadness and other nations do the same, how are we relatively any better protected than we are now? While we may be better prepared for defense others are equally better prepared for attack. And so it will go on without end; there is no hope in that policy. Europe has tried it for centuries; the only effect is to make wars more terrible; it does not prevent them in the least? Why ,then, follow this stupid, suicidal policy any longer? We know that it always has failed, and that it must fail as long as it is tried.

There is no disputing the fact that the real desire of at least very many of the advocates of universal military training is to have an army ready so it can be used in coercing labor. It is an idea as old as ancient Rome; it has always been the view of the privileged classes of Europe that a regular army could be depended upon to fight for the King and aristrocracy; and this has generally been the case. In a labor struggle it would be evidently impossible to recruit an army by voluntary enlistments. It is necessary to have an army not in touch with the masses of the people and whose officers were in close social touch and sympathy with the wealthy and privileged classes. In many European nations a military career was the only one open to sons of the aristrocacy. It may be that this is best—we are not discussing that—but let the matter be clearly understood.

Now is the peace crisis of all history. There never was a time when everything that in the least looks towards war should be avoided. It cannot possibly be claimd that we need military training right now. We have four million men already trained and enormous stores of muitions and arms. There never was less need for anything than there is for universal military training in the United States right now, or will be for a number of years. We are trying to establish a League of Nations to prevent war. What chance has such a league to succeed if the chief nations show that they have no confidence in it? Even if the arguments of the affirmative were valid as general principles, they are not valid under the conditions which just now exist. The chief business of the world now is to establish the League of Nations; if that fails than it will be time enuf to talk of universal military training.

In America we all believe in the rights of labor; we wish to see labor get far more than it has ever received; but we must not overlook the fact that labor is not always wisely led. In the past year labor has not been following its own leaders even. This is the universal experience of all history. It has been labor's calamity to be often led by impractical visionaries, by selfish demagogs. Napoleon was such a leader. He appeared as a champion of the common people and ended by establishing himself as a monarch more autocratic than the Bourbons. The same thing happened in the recent revolution in China; Yuan-Shi-Ki was elected president but soon declared himself emperor. Tho the attempt faild it shows the tendency. The recent experience of Russia

is another illustration. In the end, labor always suffers most by the breaking down of law by mob rule. No state can exist or ever did exist unless mob rule and the demagog are kept in abeyance. The plea that the military might be used against labor riots is dangerous demagogry.

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS TO AID IN BRINGING OUT THE CHIEF ISSUES

1. Is a modern Nation safe without an army? 2. Would the League of Nations entirely do away with the need of an army? 3. Even if a people thought a foren government would be better for them than their own would they be justified in surrendering their liberties? 4. Is a government something a people can do what they wish with, or is it a trust for future generations? 5. Would the influence of the United States among the nations of the earth be increast or diminisht by universal military training? 6. If increast would it be due to fear or to increast moral influence? 7. Would the need of military training be increast or decreast by the League of Nations? 8. To what would a nation's influence in the League be chiefly due? 9. Under the actual conditions that exist can a nation be protected without military training sometime, somehow, somewhere? 10. Is the real question, then, under what conditions shall it be given? 11. Has anyone a right to live in a country for whose protection he is not willing to do his share? 12. Do the affirmative believe in universal military training because they like it, or because they deem it necessary? 13. Will one ambitious and unscrupulous nation always ready for war compel all other nations to be ready also?

14. Can we get an army ready in time after danger of attack appears? 15. Is an unprepared nation more likely to have war forced on it? 16. Would a difficulty be settled by an unprepared nation submitting to wrong? 17. How do China and Japan illustrate preparedness and unpreparedness? 18. If France had been as little prepared for war as England and the United States how would the Great War have resulted? 19. Make a list of the differences preparation would make in the attitude of nations towards each other? 20. Is the effect of preparedness to temporarily or permanently prevent war? 21. What effect would a nation's preparedness or lack of it have on its influence with other nations? 22. Does a nation with right intentions need to be prepared for war? 23. If zeppelins should attack one of our large cities would the nation have to pay for the damage done? 24. Is it the duty of nations to protect its citizens? 25. Can it do it without an army?

26. How long does it take to prepare an army for modern warfare? 27. How did our selected draft soldiers compare with European soldiers? 28. Would an army of ten millions be useless without equipment? 29. How would that affect the attitude of the makers of military equipment? 30. Is industrial preparedness also necessary? 31. Could we prepare an army in less time than in 1917-8? 32. If we had been attackt by a great Power what would have happened while we were getting ready? 33. Can an army be prepared while other necessary preparations are being made?

34. Is a well armd and prepared nation more likely to attack some other nation than one which is unarmd and unprepared? 35. Which would make the greater efforts to settle disputes by arbitration or diplomacy? 36. Which would be more unyielding in international controversies? 37. What chance have military men for success, fame, or achievement without war? 38. Is that apt to affect their attitude towards war? 39. Are "conscientious objectors" always right? 40. Should their convictions be respected?

41. Why should a large army be desired by the rich more than by the poor? 42. Which would suffer more by an invasion? 43. Which would suffer more ultimately? 44. Could military training be made to bear equally on rich and poor alike? 45. Could the poor spare the time for it as easily as the rich? 46. Do the interests of the poor require it as much as the interests of the rich? 47. If we had universal military training should any be exempted? 48. Are military forces desired for any other purpose than repelling foren invasions? 49. What effect would universal military training have on strikes? 50. What on mobs and other disorders? 51. Is a citizen army more likely to be used to oppress the people or to defend them in case of domestic controversies?

52. How large an army would universal military training give us? 53. Do we need that large an army? 54. Why make training universal if it is not needed? 55. Would it bear equally on all? 56. Would men out of work be wronged as much as those in important positions? 57. Why should all be drafted alike if all are not needed? 58. Can we depend on volunteers to keep as large an army as we need? 59. How could a universal military training law be enforced? 60. Would it have to be enforced by local authorities, by the State, or by the National Government? 61. Would we have to create new machinery for its enforcement? 62. What effect would it have on our foren population? 63. Do a majority of our young men favor universal military training? 64. Why don't they take it voluntarily then? 65. Should the rest of the people force such a law on them? 66. Are the young men of mil-

itary age less patriotic and loyal than the rest of the people? 67. Would the young men volunteer if they believed it necessary? 68. Would all of them volunteer? 69. Should those who do not be rewarded for not doing so? 70. Should the brave, generous, and loyal preserve the nation for the benefit of the cowardly, selfish, and disloyal?

71. How could we tell how large an army to prepare? 72. If we had universal military training would we have to have exemption boards? 73. Should there be uniform exemption laws, or should each board use its own judgment? 74. Could as good men be got for exemption boards in time of peace as in war times? 75. Would you compel non-naturalized citizens to serve? 78. What effect would universal military training have on the number and status of aliens among us? 79. Could Universal military training be made "universal?"

80. Are those most in favor of military training the ones who would take it? 81. If they had to, how would it affect thir opinions? 82. Could military training be universal without being made compulsory? 83. Should those unwilling to take it be drafted? 84. Would those who resist the draft be real criminals? 85. Should they be shut up with murderers, horsethieves, etc.? 86. Does the decision of the majority make a thing morally right or only legally right? 87. Should the time for military training be taken from school time, or from the time when young men are entering life work? 88. Would it interfere very much with our regular American mode of life? 89. Why do educators generally oppose military training in schools? 90. What part could women have in military training? 91. What effect would its introduction in schools have on the daily schedule? 92. What could the girls and the rejected boys do during the drill hours?

93. What are the essential features of the Swiss system? 94. Could we introduce it without interference with schools? 95. Some modification of the Swiss system has been advocated in this for several years; has anyone stated definitely just what modifications? Why? 96. Can military training be given in the schools? 97. Are military gymnastics the kind needed by school children? 98. What should be the exact scope of military training? 99. Should all have exactly the same training? 100. Should it include sanitary engineering, chemical and civil engineering? 101. Should it include nursing, transportation, handling supplies, etc.? 102. Should it include office, clerical, and administrative work? 103. Is industrial preparedness equally necessary? 104. Should it include navy, aeroplane, artillery, etc.? 105. Would some of these require longer

time than others?

106. Is soldier life as conductive to good morals as life at home? 107. Why are there more murders, mobs, assaults, lynchings, etc., in the United States than in any other civilized nation? 108. Would military training be likely to improve our record in that respect? 109. Military training enforces habits of obedience; is it the same kind of obedience required in civil life? 110. Are soldiers more moral than other men? 111. Is soldier training identical with citizenship training? 112. May a soldier use his own judgment? 113. Would military training develop the judgment needed at the ballot box? 114. What is the effect of military training on health? 115. Can the same results be obtained some other way?

116. Does national safety take the precedence of everything else whatever? 117. What real protection does the negative offer? 118. Would military training afford certain protection? 119. Would anything offered by the negative do it? 120. Should our conduct in this matter be determined by ideal theories of what ought to be, or by the actual facts that confront us? 121. Even if national safety could ultimately be secured without universal military training can it be for the next ten years? 122. What would be the use of protection after our nation is defeated and destroyed? 123. Would the application of Christianity solve the problem? 124. Must the burdens of militarism become intolerable? 125. Is the future safe either with armies or without them? 126. What can we do about it?

BIBLLOGRAPHY

(The first figure indicates the volume; the second figure the page.)

SCHOOL AND SOCIETY, Garrison, N. Y. 10c.

9:25; Military Training in Colleges.

8:438; Baseball, a Boy's game. J. M. Taylor.

8:529; Essentials of Physical Education in relation to Military Training. F. L. Kleeberger.

8:17: Military Instruction for College Students.

8:72; Military Training at Columbia University.

8:644; Military Training for Boys in N. Y. State.

6:762; Military Training in the Schools.

2:694; Should there be military training in public schools? L. P. Lochner.

1:289; Should our educational system include studies which prepare for war? N. C. Schaefer.

2:789; Broader Program for Physical Education.

3:460; Military Drill in Public Schools.
3:751; Military training in Colleges and Schools.
3:278; Military training in American high schools. C. H. Johnston.
3:317; Military Training in Colleges.
4:102; National Educational Association and Military Training in Schools.
4:9; A Schoolmaster's view of compulsory military training.

WORLD'S WORK. Garden City, N. Y. 35c.
37:705; University Training and Officers.
37:547; What kind of Military Training?
3:16; Shall we adopt Universal military Service? Chas. W. Elliott.
29:419; Military Preparedness without Militarism. A Willert.
32:138; Preparedness vs. Militarism.

CURRENT OPINION. 65 W. 35, N. Y. 25c.
64:399; What enlisted men think of our Military System.
59:7; Should we adopt the Swiss Army system?
61:115; Compulsory Military Training in the Schools and the national need for preparedness.

THE NEW REPUBLIC. 421 W. 21st St., N. Y. 10c.
6:266; Real Implications of Conscription. Norman Angell.
6:309; Universal Service as Education. John Dewey.
7:217; A Moral Equivalent for Universal Military Service, Randolph Bourne.
7:318; Military folly in N. Y.

THE NATION. 20 Vesey Street, N. Y. 10c.
107:69; Universal Military Training, C. F. Goodrich.
109:334; Framed in France; propaganda for Univ. Mil. Training, H. J. Hibschman.
108:973; Amer. Militarism Waning.
101:402; Conscription; Summary of Arguments for and against. J. F. Muirhead.
102:518; Fear God and Take your own Part. T. Roosevelt.
97:278; Must we all Bear Arms?
101:715; Sweet Voices of Conscription. W. R. Browne.
102:510; Universal Military Service Cure-all.

LIVING AGE, 41 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass. 15c.
300:337; Was Lord Roberts right? Lord Haldane.

EVERYBODY'S. Spring & MacDougal Sts., N. Y. 25c.
40:9: Lest We Forget; A. Roosevelt.
32:120; America on Guard. T. Roosevelt.
34:150; Wyoming's Answer to Militarism. Geo. Creel.

THE DIAL, 152 W. 13th, N. Y. 10c.

66:470; Mili ary Training in Education. J. J. McSwain.

66:71; Military Training in Education. G. Soule.

77;137; Military Paternalism and Industrial unrest. G. Robinson.

LITERARY DIGEST, 354 Fourth Ave., N. Y. 10c.

62:14; To Raise all our Boys to be Soldiers.

51:917; Our Holiday Recruits.

53:186; Military Drill in Public Schools.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS, 30 Irving Place, N. Y. 35c.

58:173; Military Training at Princeton. J. G. Hibben.

52:608; Compulsory Military Service.

54:339; Democratic Aspects of Universal Military Service.

53:449; Swiss and Australian Military Systems, F. L. Huidekoper.

52:577: Military Training in Public Schools. L. M. Green, and A. Gradenwitz.

52:301; The Plattsburg Response. W. Menkel.

52:260; Where Education Fails.

53:201: Training Student Soliders. W. Rushton.

53:570; What Shall we do for our boys. C. F. Goodrich.

53:351: Military Training in Land Grant Colleges.

54:216; Fundamentals of Military Training.

THE PUBLIC, 5th Ave., and 13th St., N. Y. 10c.

21:490; Betraying our Cause.

THE INDEPENDENT: 119 w. 40, N. Y. 10c.

93:318; Corporal Bill on a Hike.

84:372; Comp, Service in a Democracy at War.

85:15; Training our Youth for Defense. G. R. Chamberlain.

89:22; Military Mind. W. T. Colyer.

82:532; Colleges and National defense. J. G. Hibben.

82:92; Military Training for College Students.

85:253; Military in Public Schools.

THE OUTLOOK, 381 Fourth Ave., N. Y. 10c.

119:105; Training Young Americans. C. K. Taylor.

112:307; Making of Citizen Soldiers.

113:918; The last Gasp of Voluntaryism, C. L. Hall.

THE FORUM, 118 E. 28th, N. Y. 30.

50:385; Permanent Military Machine Necessary; is it compatible with democracy? G. E. Chamberlain.

Sept. '16:294; Collapse of our Militarism.

Nov. '16; Solving the Hyphen. H. Breckenridge.

SCIENCE, Garrison, N. Y. 10c.

49:404; Some Physical Improvements in National Army Men under Mil. Training. E. M. Hildebrandt.

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, Easton, Pa. 35c.

55:410; Mil. Training in high schools. E. L. Hildebrandt.

THE SURVEY, 112 E. 19th St., N. Y. 10c.

39:660; The President against Military Training.

42:859; Preparing for Preparedness. R. D. Leigh.

35:743; Preparedness and the People. W. O. Thompson.

36:201; Army as a School Service. C. J. Post.

36:615; National Straight Jacket inside out.

36:127; Save the little red school house. C. A. Thomas.

36:418; Resolutions of the N. E. A. on military Training in schools. W. D. Lane.

HARPER'S WEEKLY, 119 W. 40th St., N. Y. 10c.

61:55; Swiss Army Lesson, Norman Hapgood.

61:79; What we Need, L. M. Garrison.

61:172; Range Finders. H. D. Wheeler.

61:201; Plattsburg—What is it? H. D. Wheeler.

61:484; The American School Army. K. E. Keller.

62:271; The Defense Problem.

EDUCATION, 120 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.

36:611; Military Training in the high school. David Snedden. See also 30:92.

SCHOOL REVIEW, University of Chicago, Press. 15c.

24:156; Military Drill in the high cshools.

24:312; Same.

LADIES' HOME JOURNAL. Philadeplhia, Pa. 15c.

33:11; Your Boy and Mine.

GENERAL SOURCES, (Mostly free.)

Your Congressman. Washington, D. C.

National Security League. 31 Pine St, N. Y.

American Union against Militarism. Washington, D. C., Munsey Bldg.

American Assn. for International Concilation, 407, 117th St., N. Y. 10c.

The H. W. Wilson Co., 958 University Avenue, N. Y.

Books, etc.

Annals American Academy, Vol. 66. Philadelphia. $1.00.

G. L. Dickenson; The Choice before Us, Dodd, Mead & Co., N. Y. $2.00.

J. C. Wise; The Call of the Republic, E. P. Dutton, N. Y. $1.

Lucien Howe; Universal Mil.Edn. and Service, G. P. Putnam's Sons, N. Y. $1.25.

INDEX

Adams, John ---- 65
Bibliografy ---- 86
Brief Paragrafs ---- 76
Calkins, C. E. ---- 70
Croly, Herbert ---- 3
Dewey, Prof. John ---- 69, 72
Edmands, Col. Thomas F. ---- 69
Elliott, Dr. Chas. W. ---- 60, 69
Findley, Pres. John H. ---- 72
Giddings, Dr. F. H. ---- 14
Glenn, Col. E. F. ---- 75
Gompers, Samuel ---- 71
Hughes, Chas. E. ---- 69, 72
Huidekoper, F. H. ---- 58, 69
Jackson, Andrew ---- 68
Jefferson, Thomas ---- 66
Jordan, David Starr ---- 69
Judson, Dr. Harry Pratt ---- 59
Libbey, Fredrick J. ---- 32
Madison, James ---- 67
Military Training League ---- 50
Mitchel, John Purroy ---- 71
Monroe, James ---- 68
Nasmyth, George ---- 20
Presidents, Opinion of ---- 64
Questions to Aid Study ---- 83
Sargent, Dr. Dudley A. ---- 60
Schaeffer, Dr. Nathan C. ---- 72
Scott, Gen. H. L. ---- 28
Stratton, Prof. G. M. ---- 72
Villard, Oswald G. ---- 43
Washington, George ---- 64
Wood, Gen. Leonard A. ---- 73
Wright, Luke E. ---- 70
Young, Gen. S. B. M. ---- 40

3 0112 072679134